

THE  
BOSTON QUARTERLY REVIEW.

---

JANUARY, 1841.

---

ART. I. — *Conversations with a Radical.* By a CON-  
SERVATIVE.

My attention was arrested one day, during a short residence in a Western city, by a crowd collected before the principal hotel. Wedging my way into the crowd, I soon discovered that the object of attention was a coarsely clad fellow, holding forth to the multitude from the very top of his lungs. He appeared to be speaking under strong excitement. He gesticulated rapidly and with violence. His tones were harsh and bitter; his looks were wild and haggard; and his whole figure and manner indicated a madman, or a person uttering himself on a subject, which absorbed the whole energy of his soul.

"Ye make us beasts of burden;" were the first words I could make out. "Ye call yourselves the higher orders, because ye can task the labors of the poor and wretched. Ye are the higher orders, are ye, because ye wear fine clothes, have long purses, live in splendid palaces, and recline on soft couches; because ye have large estates, well cultivated fields, rich harvests, groaning granaries, and crowded store-houses? By whose labor are ye what ye call yourselves? By your own? 'T is false. 'T is by the labor of those

ye call the lower class, on whose rights, feelings, and interests ye trample every moment, and for whom ye care less than ye care for your oxen or your horses. Ye strut and swell with a boasted superiority, do ye? Know ye not that ye purchase it by the tears of the widow, the wrongs of the orphan, and the blood of those ye should have loved as ye love yourselves?

"The higher orders, are ye? Ay, for ye make men carry you on their shoulders; ay, for ye ride on the backs of those of your fellow beings who have too much honesty, or too much simplicity, to be riders themselves. And now, forsooth, ye raise a terrible hue and cry because we, whom ye have ridden for ages, show ourselves a little restive and unwilling to stand ready bitted and saddled, for you to vault upon our backs, and plunge your rowels deep into our flanks. Order is in danger, is it, because the horse learns his strength and turns upon his rider? Society is to be dissolved, is it, because your oppression is to end? Vain are your threats; vain are your pictures of mobocracy and anarchy; ye shall be unhorsed. We have sworn it in the depths of our souls, on the altars of our country, in the presence of our God. We will carry you no longer. Use your own limbs. Ye may as well go on foot as we. Go build your own houses, cultivate your own fields, make your own tools, man your own ships, work your own engines. Ye may as well do it for yourselves, as that we should be poor and ignorant in order to do it for you. No longer will we toil, and sweat, and suffer, that ye may enjoy, or be corrupted by wealth and luxury. The higher orders, are ye? puling babes, miserable victims of your own avarice or extravagance, worshippers of fashion, men forsworn, who study only to profit by the labors of others! The higher orders, are ye? Go then and form a nation of higher orders, a nation apart by yourselves, and see how long ye will maintain your elevation."

As he uttered these last words in a tone, which one must have heard, in order to form any conception of

its provokingness, a stone, sent from no unskilful hand, struck him on the side of the head, and knocked him senseless to the ground. "Good!" shouted the multitude, and dispersed to their several places of business. Though provoked by the fellow's radical nonsense, and uncalled-for declamation, I ran to ascertain the effects of the blow, and to see whether any assistance was possible or needed. I found him stunned, but not seriously injured. It is no easy matter to kill an enthusiast. His body is so completely under the control of the spirit, and so saturated with it, that it becomes itself all but spiritual and impassible. I had him conducted to my lodgings, where all needed assistance was rendered him. In a few hours he was perfectly recovered, except a slight contusion on his head, from which, however, he assured me he suffered no pain.

I have not a spice of radicalism in my nature. It is true, I was a poor boy, and that for some years I had a hard struggle; but now, all my habits, my interests, and, I may add, my convictions, are with the Conservatives. I do not feel it my duty to set up for a Reformer, to be wiser than all who went before me, than most of my contemporaries. I am not yet capable of so much arrogance. I am content to follow on in "the path my forefathers trod." I have aimed to check whatever tendencies I may possibly have had towards enthusiasm, and I am in general as cold and as immovable as the granite hills of my own New-England. Yet this ranting street orator affected me, and made me wish to examine him at my leisure. He struck me as a riddle, but also as a riddle worth the reading. Perhaps there is something in lofty enthusiasm, in the power of self-sacrifice, in a disposition, that goes straight to its object, regardless of difficulties, or dangers, or death, however mistimed or misplaced, which cannot be witnessed with indifference; something perhaps to warm the coldest hearts, and agitate minds the best disciplined. No philosopher seems able to offer a more convincing argument for his system than to die for it. Samson destroyed more of his enemies



by his death, than by his life ; and the early Christians conquered the world by dying for it.

There was another reason why I wished to examine this fellow, who was the incarnation of Radicalism. Radicalism was rife in my native city. It was threatening everything with destruction. Insubordination was becoming universal. Strikes and combinations, and trades' unions, were paving the way for a return to the savage state. Property was becoming insecure, and there was no foreseeing what the sovereign mob might not, one day, take it into its head to do. Perhaps it would even go so far as to propose a division of property, and to distribute among the idle and vicious the fruits of the labors of the industrious and the virtuous. I wished to make myself thoroughly acquainted with the character, designs, resources, and expectations of Radicalism. This fellow, whom chance had thrown in my way, might instruct me. I therefore urged him to spend a few days with me, which he readily consented to do, as he was one of those who go about doing *good* when they have not where to lay their heads. During his stay with me, we ran over a great variety of topics, some of which we discussed with a little closeness and depth, and others we merely touched upon. The principal results of our intercourse and discussions, are contained in the following Conversations, which were written down immediately after, and as nearly as they occurred, as possible. If I have not in all cases refuted his mischievous notions, it must be borne in mind, that my chief object was not to show my own argumentative powers, — which those who know me will admit to be not contemptible, — nor to vindicate my own doctrines ; but to draw out the Radical, and make myself, if possible, acquainted with his inmost soul. My friends, I am sure, will agree with me, that his notions in general need no refutation. I soon perceived that his conversion to rationality was hopeless, and I ceased to attempt it. Whatever I said was intended to give him an opportunity to express his opinions.

One by reading these Conversations will hardly form an adequate conception of the Radical as he really appeared. Sometimes, his manner was courteous, his tones were bland, and he showed clearly that he had seen good society ; at other times, his voice was harsh, and his whole manner coarse and revolting. There were times when the proudest and firmest must have quailed beneath the withering scorn of his look, and the biting sarcasm of his tones ; times there were too, when he seemed inspired, and you felt that you were in the presence of a God-ordained prophet. He was a mystery. Whether hate, envy, spleen, or love, high undying philanthropy governed him, I could never satisfy myself ; and the only conclusion to which I have been able to arrive is, that he was intended for a great man, but disappointment, misfortune, struggles with the world, and perhaps ill health, had affected his brain, and that at the time I saw him, he was in need of a strait jacket. Perhaps, however, I am mistaken. Let those who peruse the following Conversations judge for themselves. Let them determine whether he should be revered as a prophet, dreaded as a devil incarnate, or confined as a madman.

#### CONVERSATION I.

*C.* THAT was a saucy fellow who threw that stone at your head ; had he killed you, as I was afraid he had, I should have deemed it a disgrace to my country.

*R.* If my blood could redeem my brethren, and restore them to their long lost, and long forgotten rights, freely would I pour it out like water.

*C.* You use strong language, but I see nothing to warrant it. This is the land of freedom, of equal rights, where man is man and nothing more. We open the road to merit alone ; and if some obtain richer prizes than others, it is because they are more deserving. Really, Sir, I see no cause of excitement, or even complaint.

*R.* You are pleasant.

*C.* Not at all. I never treat with lightness that which is a matter of gravity with another. But I cannot avoid believing him, who complains in this blessed country, a grumbler by nature, or else out of his wits. We are all substantially equal.

*R.* Equal! pray, Sir, where have you lived?

*C.* With my countrymen, who have at times reposed some little confidence in me, and whom I have endeavored to serve according to the measure of my ability.

*R.* You are in easy circumstances?

*C.* I am not what is called poor.

*R.* You have leisure to ride about and see the country, to view the beauties and wonders of nature, the miracles of art and science, to cultivate your taste and enrich your mind with ancient and modern lore?

*C.* Through the goodness of God, who has prospered me, I have something of this.

*R.* And your friends and associates are among the fashionable and polite, the educated and refined, persons belonging to the upper classes, with leisure like yourself, taste, habits, and pursuits similar to your own?

*C.* I rarely choose my friends from the vicious and vulgar.

*R.* You can take your choice of schools and teachers, give your children the best education afforded by the country, and a vantage ground on commencing their active career in life?

*C.* I am thankful that I can.

*R.* And these advantages are worth something in your estimation?

*C.* I certainly prize them very highly.

*R.* How large a proportion of our whole population, do you suppose, possess the same or similar advantages?

*C.* Probably not more than one in a hundred.

*R.* Yet we are all substantially equal!

*C.* Not precisely equal, I admit; but we are as nearly so as is possible or desirable.

*R.* I know not that. I know not where the possible ends, or the impossible begins. A greater degree



of equality *you* indeed may not desire ; but what will say the ninety and nine who are not so favored as you are ?

*C.* There are indeed always some malignant spirits to envy the prosperous, and to declaim against the virtue which is above them. Such may desire a greater degree of equality, as the rascal with the halter round his neck, may desire the abolition of capital punishment.

*R.* The ninety and nine, whom God, according to your reckoning, has not seen fit to favor as much as he has you, will no doubt feel obliged to you for likening them to the rascal with a halter round his neck, declaiming against hanging. You, who are at the top of society, are very apt to think that your opinions and your wishes are the only ones worth regarding ; and you think that you have a perfect right to sneer at the views and wishes of those who are at its base. But the time has gone by when you could sneer with impunity. From time out of mind we have looked up to you as oracles ; we have received your decisions as those of a god. When you told us, that it was necessary that some should be rich and revered, and that others should be poor, miserable, despised, and trampled on, we believed you, and submitted to our hard fate. It did not occur to us, that the advice you gave us was the advice of the rider to his horse. But now we understand you. We know the value of your opinions. When you tell us no more equality is desirable, we immediately ask ourselves, whether you ride or are ridden ; whether you are those who reap all the benefits of society, or those who bear all its burdens. It is pleasant to ride, but hardly so to be ridden. It is very pleasant to reap the benefits, but not quite so pleasant to submit to the labor of producing them for others.

*C.* But who can better judge of the value of the social system as it is, than they who are the most enlightened, and whose elevated position enables them to see it as a whole, and to mark all its workings ?

*R.* The master would no doubt tell his slave, who

should question the justice or utility of slavery, that his position was too low to see its beauties. It is only the master, who stands on the slave's shoulders, that can see the excellency of slavery. So, only you, who are at the topmost round of the social ladder, are raised high enough to see the beauty and excellence of the present order of things. But, if we are not high enough to see its beauty and excellence, we are low enough to feel its weight, and to suffer from its injustice; and we know not why we should bear this oppressive weight, and endure this injustice, merely that you alone may be elevated, and be freed from all burdens, and have nothing to do but to praise the system of things from which you alone profit. We are the many; our interests are as sacred in our eyes as yours are in yours; we desire a greater degree of equality, and as we are as ninety and nine to one, we can hardly be persuaded that what is desirable to us, is upon the whole undesirable.

C. You labor under a greivous mistake. It is for the benefit of the low that some should be above them. Those who are up, help raise those who are down.

R. Admirable way indeed to raise a man, that of planting your feet on his shoulders! Be so good as to step off of our shoulders, and we will get up of ourselves.

C. The upper classes do not stand on the shoulders of the lower. This is all fancy on your part.

R. On what then do they stand? What keeps them up? Where there are several strata, one lying above another, I have always supposed the one above rested for its support on the one below.

C. In physics you may be right, but in moral science things are different. The upper classes rest on their own merit.

R. Very modest! Not content with depriving us of the fruits of our labors, you would monopolize all the merit in God's universe! Moderate your pretensions. Merit, moral merit, is confined to no stratum of socie-



ty ; but may be found in all, and as often in the lowest as in the highest ; in the hovel as in the palace ; clad in rags as in embroidery. But enough of this. Even you, notwithstanding your social position, I trust, retain some of the feelings of the man, and even you, I believe, if you would take an impartial survey of society as it is, would admit, that more equality than now obtains, is desirable.

*C.* I have seen society ; I think I know what it is.

*R.* You have seen it from a lofty position, and at a distance ; come now and view it nearer by, and from a lower position. Down here, in these valleys, are many things which you may not have seen, or which you may have forgotten, or not considered. Go with me along our public works, our unfinished railroads and canals, and observe attentively this mass of abject beings whose labor constructs them. The contractors, who grow rich by working them as the teamster works his horses or his oxen, no doubt delights in their abjectness, for were they less abject, or were there fewer of them, he would be obliged to treat them better and pay them more wages, and perhaps be unable to hire them at all. Mark them, Sir, kicked and knocked about by those petty tyrants, called overseers, and tell me if you see no distance between them and the nabob corporator, which it would be desirable to lessen ?

*C.* You speak of foreigners. The old World annually disgorges upon us her thousands and tens of thousands of vagabonds. I wish it could be prevented.

*R.* These vagabonds, as you call them, are human beings ; and human beings, wherever born, and whatever be the color of their fate or their skin, are to me not foreigners, but fellow citizens and brethren. But leave them ; they are mostly Irish, and we are yet hardly able to reckon the Irish within the pale of Humanity. Go into your factories — you may be a factory owner for aught I know — go into your factories and mark those pale-visaged girls chained to the spindle or the loom, growing “part and parcel” of the machinery on which they tend, and the bare mention

of whom would make the wives and daughters of the factory owners turn up their noses, and tell me if you desire no greater degree of equality than now exists between those pale-visaged girls, and the up-nose-turning wives and daughters of the factory owners? Or go into your cities, into the back streets, dark lanes and blind courts, the damp cellars and unventilated garrets, crowded with human beings incrustated with filth and wallowing in the mire; and then go and view the mansions of the rich, fronting our broad, clean, and airy streets or open public squares; and tell me honestly if you see no more inequality than you deem desirable?

*C.* That there are some degraded and suffering beings among us, I do not mean to deny; but their own vice and folly, ignorance or crime, make them so. Nobody need be poor and miserable in this country.

*R.* Nor in any other. I thank you for the admission. If none need be poor and miserable, what mean you when you say a greater degree of equality is impossible? I had hoped to find you too clear-headed to fall into a contradiction so common. You tell me—as almost every man tells me—that a greater degree of equality is neither possible nor desirable; when I point you to instances which you cannot see without having all the better part of your nature cry out for more equality,—instances of poverty which it is shocking to behold and painful to remember,—you relieve yourself by saying, this poverty, though not desirable, is unnecessary; it originates in the ignorance or depravity of the poor. That you may not feel any qualms of conscience for living in luxury while others are suffering for the necessities of life, you assert that they suffer through their own fault, and that they need not be so poor. But in asserting this, you admit the possibility of producing a greater degree of equality. According to your own account, poverty then, is not necessary. Then it may be removed; then a greater degree of equality is possible.

*C.* I mean a greater degree of equality is impracti-

cable. We might indeed divide all the property of the community equally among all its members; but three days would not elapse before some one would dispose of his share to another, and the old inequality would soon be reproduced, and in an aggravated form.

*R.* Admit this; it only shows that the method, you mention, is not the right method for introducing equality.

*C.* But, Sir, there have always been the poor, and there always will be, and the sooner we come to this conclusion the better.

*R.* If it comes to prophesying, I may as well prophesy as you; I have as good a right to prophesy good as you have to prophesy evil. Poverty, you say, will never be cured; it requires not a little prophetic power to be able to look far enough into futurity to be certain of that.

*C.* "The poor ye have always with you," said Jesus, and Moses assures us they "shall never cease out of the land." Whatever you may say of my prophetic power, I hope you will not call in question that of Moses and Jesus. God has in the depths of his own wisdom ordained poverty. I consider poverty an appointment, an express and beneficent appointment of God.

*R.* Then go and give away what you have, and be poor.

*C.* It is my duty to take care of what God has entrusted to my keeping.

*R.* And so thought, I presume, the young man who came to Jesus to inquire what he should do to inherit eternal life. It is easy for you to say that poverty is a beneficent appointment of God; for in one sense it is beneficent to *you*; you could not be rich if others were not poor. It is their poverty that makes your wealth. You can have wealth and leisure, because there are many poor to labor for you. But is poverty a beneficent appointment to the *poor*? Do you believe it! Why then have you ransacked heaven and earth, fire and water, sea and land to



become rich? Do you believe it! Why then do you submit to the self-denial of being rich, and to the care of your huge estate? Do you believe it! Go then and take the place of him who is kicked from good society, because he wears a thread-bare coat and a sun-burnt face, who is made the common drudge, who must bear all the burdens of society, minister to the wants of the rich, and be despised and trampled on for it; go place yourself by the side of that poor mother weeping over her naked, freezing, starving children, and enduring the agony of a thousand deaths, as she sees them drop piecemeal into the grave; and then talk of poverty as a beneficent appointment of God!

*C.* You are warm. Poverty is a blessed means to prepare its subjects for another world.

*R.* What then, shall become of the rich? Do you believe this? How then do you hope to prepare yourself for another world? Shame on your base hypocrisy! Poverty a blessed means to prepare its subjects for another world! Did you not but now charge the poverty of the poor to their indolence, their vice, and their crime? Are indolence, vice, and crime the true preparations for heaven? Is he, whose every thought is racked to devise means to support the human animal, passing under the best discipline to prepare him for Heaven? Away with such nonsense. It has already done injury enough to religion. You and your allies, the priests, have so effectually charged the sufferings we endure upon God, that they have succeeded in filling the land with Atheism. Has the poor man complained of poverty; happy is the poor man, for though poor and miserable here, he is sure of heaven hereafter, it is replied; and the priest pockets his tithe, and the tyrant sits secure on his throne.

## CONVERSATION II.

*C.* You have evidently received a superior education, and yet I find you the very incarnation of Radicalism. This to me is a mystery.

*R.* Why so? Is there any necessary incongruity between a good education, and a sincere devotion to the interests of mankind,—an unquenchable thirst to promote the well-being of the poor and the neglected?

*C.* Perhaps not. But I have not been accustomed to look for Radicals among the educated.

*R.* Nor anybody else that knows anything. Still, education has no higher or holier vocation than that of fitting its subjects to be stern, uncompromising, and indefatigable Reformers. But the educated among us belong to the more-favored classes, and the more favored classes are always opposed to Reform, or—if it suit you better—to Innovation. A part of the educated owe their superior education to the fact, that they belong by birth to the more favored classes; and the rest are placed in the category of the more favored classes by the fact, that they are educated. In either case, whether educated because their fathers were rich, or whether poor boys who have contrived to get an education, they then belong to the aristocracy. And why should the aristocracy be Reformers? What have they to allege against society as it is, since they have it altogether their own way; since it is altogether in their interest? A man like yourself has few inducements to be a Reformer; you can hope to gain nothing by a Reform. Bred to regard only yourself, inured by the habits of your life, and the circumstances in which you have been placed, to a selfishness all but diabolical, tolerating no upshootings of the soul for the happiness of your fellow-beings, incapable of looking for, or tasting pleasure in doing them good, what can make you engage in the grand and glorious work of social regeneration? The man who blacks your boots and brushes your coat might engage in the work of Reform, and the poor woman stewing over your kitchen fire preparing you a luxurious dinner, or a late supper, from the ill effects of which you will never recover, may be a Radical. But not you;—you have nothing to gain. You have drawn the highest prize; you have won the stake,

and why hazard another game? You may lose, but you have nothing to hope from further winnings. You are now at the top of the social ladder. A change may place you at its foot. This is the case with nearly all the educated—or if it be not the case with all, each one trusts that it will be in a few days—and can you then wonder that so few of them are Radicals? It is not because they are too wise, but because they have too great a stake in the existing order.

Nor is this all. Our young men, who receive a superior education, are not educated to regard the well-being of Humanity, to be Reformers, the champions and servants of the people; but they are educated to get their living out of the people. None of our colleges or higher seminaries imbue our young men with an unquenchable zeal for human improvement, kindle up in their hearts a burning desire to set mankind forward, a disinterested love which weds itself to the cause of Humanity, and pursues it through good report and through evil report, and never in the darkest hours relaxes its exertions. They train up our sons to manage the people skilfully, and to ride them gracefully and securely. Our professors are mere riding masters, giving lessons in the noble art of horsemanship. No man can be a Professor unless he be an aristocrat or a conservative.

*C.* Why not?

*R.* Because our colleges and higher seminaries are founded by the wealthy, and are under the control of those whom the present order of things most favors, and because these will choose no man to be a professor, unless he be one in whom they can confide. They can confide in no man who is in favor of any social changes, innovations, or improvements. They are men of the present, whom the present most favors, and they must naturally distrust all who do not in return favor the present. Moreover, to be chosen a professor a man must be a popular man. But the men, who are devoted to the highest and most enduring interests of mankind, are never popular. He who has



the misfortune to think in advance of his contemporaries, and to desire a good for mankind beyond that already attained, is necessarily unpopular. If he venture to translate his thoughts into words, and his hopes into actions, he will be branded a jacobin, an agrarian, a leveller, an anarchist, or at best, a visionary, who, though he may mean well, is to be pitied, not trusted. Men who have faith in the future, whose mental vision sweeps a broader than the vulgar horizon, whose souls burn to raise up the low, to break the fetters of the slave, to open the prison doors to them that are bound, to preach glad tidings to the poor, hope to the desponding, consolation to the sorrowing, and life to the dead, must always count on being discarded by their own age and country. They cannot but be misinterpreted. They cannot but pass for what they are not, and would abhor to be. And how is it possible, that such men should be chosen to superintend the education of our children?

To be popular one must be a man of the present, uphold things as they are, never disturb the world with new views, but merely echo the sentiments he finds in vogue. He who can echo these the loudest, and with the greatest distinctness, is sure to be the most popular. Such men never trouble their age; they disturb no one's prejudices, excite no alarm, produce no commotion. Such men always look for in colleges, and therefore never look to colleges for Reformers, for new ideas, or for encouragement to labor in the cause of mankind. New ideas are placed in the world by those whom the world knows not, or whom it disowns if it knows them. Reforms come from the obscure and the unheeded; from a peasant and his fishermen followers, not from the popular and the honored. The weak things of this world are chosen to confound the mighty, and foolish things to bring to nought the wisdom of the wise.

*C.* You do not appear to hold popular men in very high esteem.

*R.* Not I. That is, if you mean by popular men those whom everybody praises, whose name is in every-

body's mouth, and whom their own age holds up as worthy of all imitation. I for one, claim no affinity with such men, and stay as short a time in their presence as possible. I am not of their parish. I cannot hurrah with the multitude, when they pass by, or deign to make a speech. God knows I do not envy, but pity them. Poor creatures ! It is their fate to live and die without ever having felt the throes of a single idea, and without the consolation of having contributed aught to the movement of the race. With the present, pass away the popular men after whom the multitude now run ; and as yesterday is swallowed up in to-day, so will they be lost in the generation to come, and be remembered no more forever. The future will preserve of the men now living only those who have had some forecast of that which is to come, and shooting by their own generation, have dared live, and labor, and suffer, for posterity.

C. You talk strangely for a Radical. I have always supposed a Radical a mere compound of envy and malignity.

R. And may you live long enough to repent of your error. What is there in this world to envy ! I have seen all that it has to offer ; I have tasted of all that, which the many pursue as their chief good. I know what it is to be honored, and eulogized, to be rich and courted, to have my name in the gazette, and made the theme of the orator and the bard. It is all vanity. Wealth, fame, pleasure, pomp, place, power, — they are mere shadows. I look with pity on him who sighs after them, and with unaffected sorrow on him whom they encumber. Poor things ! bask in your little hour of sunshine ; make the most of its warmth, for an eternal winter of neglect and forgetfulness awaits you. Could I envy, it should be none but a Socrates drinking his hemlock, a Paul brought before Nero, a Vane at his prayers on the scaffold. I know not but I might envy the martyr burning at the stake, for religion, for country, for justice, for unswerving devotion to truth, duty, God, man ; but I can conceive of nothing else in this world to envy. But enough of this.

To return to education. Our colleges and higher seminaries are not only instituted by, but for, the more favored classes. These classes — and you attest it — are always, taken collectively, conservative. They seek no social progress. They think, if we can keep things from growing worse, we shall do well to be satisfied. They therefore steadily oppose all radical changes in the social system. Details may be modified, but the ground-work must not be touched. The rough fetters of the slave, which eat into his flesh, may be polished or converted into fetters of gold; but they must not be broken. This or that poor widow may be relieved, and the great body of the poor may have the priest come and tell them, that if they will be quiet and patient here, never seeking to unhorse their riders, they shall go to heaven hereafter; but the poor, as a body, must not be elevated, and above all, must one beware how he proposes the complete and entire removal of poverty. These classes allow us to plead with all our might for the poor as individuals, for they are charitable and humane, but they forbid us under severe penalties to adopt effectual measures for the removal of the evils under which they labor. They permit us to give alms, but not to remove the necessity of almsgiving. They would mitigate the pain, for they do not delight to inflict suffering, they would mollify, but never heal the wound. This being the character of the more favored classes touching the point in question, and their character presented in its best light, is it reasonable to ask them to commit the education of their children to the care of men, who have full faith in the practicability of removing all social evils, and who would do their best to communicate that faith to their pupils? I need not ask you, if you would choose a man of my opinions to be the educator of your children; for I know you would not. You would not send your children to a college of which I could be a president. My radicalism alone, without any other consideration, would prevent you from doing it. The same principle, which in this case governs you, would



govern the whole of your class. I know you all. You have no wish to have your children educated to be Reformers, because you have no faith in nor desire for Reform yourselves. You have the instinct of self-preservation. You are not likely to be suicides; and yet it were suicidal for you to encourage Reformers; for they would reform the abuses by which you are made the more favored class. Reform would deprive you of all your exclusive privileges. You would be obliged to black your own boots, sweep your own chimneys, and in all cases perform your own drudgery. Not willingly will you consent to this. You do not choose to be your own servants, and you will not be, so long as you can find others who will be servants to you; and not till you consent to be your own servants, will you consent to sustain professors who aim to prepare your children for the work of perfecting the social organization. As things now are, professors, who desire to perfect the social organization, must leave their professorships, or withhold their own convictions. If they choose to retain their chairs, they must consent to support the existing order of things; lecture in favor of order, not liberty; against anarchy, not against tyranny; and labor to send out every year an army of young conservatives, prepared to put down all tendencies to philanthropic enthusiasm, to crush every effort of the people to meliorate their condition and to perfect society; not an army of reformers, trained to their work, and able to bring science, and literature, and taste, and genius, and religion to their aid, and prepared to die, if need be, in obtaining for the human race an advanced position. No; they must wither the holiest affections, and chill the noblest aspirations of the young heart, and send it out dead and cold.

The same influence corrupts our literature and renders it hostile to democracy. Few things are more to be deplored by a true American, than what passes for American literature. It is tame and servile, so servile that it might excite the derision of an Asiatic despot. Scarcely a writer among us dares utter an

original thought, or breathe a noble aspiration. No writers have a more sovereign dread of Radicalism, than American writers. With what contempt must those Europeans, who are enlightened, and who understand that America stands pledged to what you call Radicalism, turn over the leaves of our popular Reviews and Magazines! And how discouraging indeed, must it be to the friends of Humanity in other countries, the noble spirits who plead with ignorance, combat prejudice, and struggle with the tyrant, to listen in vain for a cheering and strengthening word from America, the boasted land of the free! That word they hear not. Let not the Reformers in other lands look to us for sympathy. Our sympathies are not with the friends of truth, freedom, justice. Our writers are the faint echos of the hired defenders of priests, kings, and nobility. The world is cursed with few periodicals,—so far as they have any character,—more strictly anti-radical and purely conservative than the New-York and North American Reviews. Even Blackwood and the London Quarterly are less so. The New-York Review is rescued from contempt, because it has courage enough to avow its real character; but the North American hardly ever dares say, good Lord or good devil, though it has a manifest longing to say good devil, having, I presume, a presentiment that it must fall into his hands at last.\* We sometimes complain that the old world does not respect us. Let us cease to complain, and study to deserve respect, by being true to our principles. No object is more contemptible than a democratic people apologizing for their democracy, and trying all possible methods to resemble those who are cursed with monarchies. *America will never be respected till she is worthy of respect, and never will she be worthy of respect, till she shall be true to herself, and dare avow and*

---

\* This abuse of the North American Review is very unchristian. We can bear witness that this Review never intentionally offends God, man, or the devil, and therefore should not be so abused.—  
EDITOR.

*defend the doctrine of equality on which her institutions are founded.* She must have a Literature in harmony with the rights of man ; and her writers, must draw from minds that have been formed in schools of equality, and from hearts that are large enough to embrace the whole family of man, and keep them warm. Man and man only must be able to kindle their enthusiasm, and inspire their strains. They must rise above all factitious distinctions, be able to pierce beneath every garb, to discover the Incarnate God though clad in rags. They must dare speak out from full minds and hearts, their free thoughts, and give them to us with all the freshness and vigor with which they come to themselves ; and to send out their feelings as warm as they gush up in their own hearts, if they would make her respectable in the eyes of those whose respect is worth having.

This is not the case now, and the reason why it is not, is obvious. Aside from the newspaper press, at present our only hope, all our literature is designed for the wealthy and educated, for the American aristocracy. I have told you the character of this aristocracy. It has no stars, no coronets ; but it has the exclusive spirit which pervades all aristocracies, less of liberality than the aristocracies of the old world, because its tenure is less secure, and because each member of it knows that it is possible he may to-morrow be at the lowest depth of the people. They who write for this aristocracy, must write to suit its views and prejudices. Most of our books, our *Quarterlies*, and our *Monthlies*, are designed for this portion of the community, and hence their conservative character. Let one of our *Quarterlies* admit an article which goes for the many instead of the few, and the few who are its supporters will at once stop their subscriptions. Without subscriptions the periodical cannot be continued, and subscriptions it cannot have unless it appeal to the exclusive interests of those who are expected to patronize it. Publishers have then their option, either to appeal to that exclusive interest, or to stop publishing.



A book written in the interests of Humanity, full of rich thoughts and noble sentiments, expressed in a style of classic elegance and purity, and with a power almost superhuman, will find few purchasers beyond the ranks of the workingmen, and even the 'workingmen, prone to take their cue from their supposed betters, will not venture to approve it. In this way nearly all the advantages of a free press are lost. Some of the best minds among us are silent, because they can find no medium through which they can utter their thoughts. A mind conscious of great wealth, of high and generous aims, noble and kindling thoughts, will not consent to pare itself down to a saleable size in the book stall. It must be allowed to speak out, and speak out freely in its own way, and its own burning words, or it will not speak at all. How much is lost by the miserable censorship, which a sickly public opinion establishes over the American press, for which our whole nation "must fare the worse," God only knows. And how many of the noblest and most gifted of our contemporaries lock up their thoughts in their own bosoms, and die because they cannot utter themselves, is a secret which will be known at the day of judgment. Our press is muzzled, because no book can be published unless it find a publisher, and if it contain an Idea, a publisher it will hardly find; because the bookseller will be afraid that the Idea will render it unpopular, and therefore unsaleable.

The pulpit is gagged in the same way. Clergymen are in some instances from the conservative class, in all cases their education, habits, and associations, tend to identify them with the aristocracy. They thus catch the aristocratic tone of thought and feeling. Restricted in their own studies principally to their professions, they depend on the better educated and wealthier members of their congregations, for their views of political economy and the social state, and consequently must adopt, even with the best intentions, conservative notions. This is not, however, true

of all. Some of them see the truth; but then how mighty are the temptations with which they are surrounded to conceal it! The clergyman depends on the aristocracy for friends and supporters; to receive the friendship and support of the aristocracy he must enter into their views, and support their interests. If he do not please the aristocracy of his parish, he may be dismissed supperless to bed; or sent out into the world, with a wife and children depending on him for support, and he not a penny in pocket, or in reputation with which to support them. To preach the Gospel in these times, and in this country,—that is, to preach it as it should be preached,—one should have the spirit of martyrdom, be prepared to live alone in the world, to be looked upon with distrust wherever he goes, to be called a visionary, or a fanatic, to be familiar with poverty, to be harassed in body and in mind, to die of disappointment and grief, and leave behind a helpless widow and friendless orphans. If he would avoid this, he must temporize, form an alliance between Christ and Belial, God and Mammon, and beware how he touches a new idea. New ideas will render him unpopular. If unpopular, he cannot collect an audience; if he cannot collect an audience, he can have no salary; and if no salary, he must cease to preach, or starve. They who hold the purse, therefore, virtually write his sermons. In a vast majority of cases the clergyman is but a speaking machine, from which the aristocracy grind out just such discourses as best please them.

These views, Sir, which doubtless are very pleasing and encouraging to you conservatives, are very saddening to me. My heart is oppressed and filled with grief. O, my countrymen,—and yet why complain? No man, who does not uphold the present, though he have a heart that would take in the whole family of man, and a mind, that with a prophet's ken, sees the future and what it demands, can obtain a hearing from his contemporaries. His own generation know him not; they neither see nor hear him. They know not how

much rich thought, how much disinterested love, what power to do and dare anything and everything for human regeneration, there may be in that heart, into which they look not, and which they will not suffer to be laid open to them. When the man of new views, the reformer, is dead, men will build him a tomb, or garnish his sepulchre; but so long as he lives they leave him to be — stoned. Yet let me not “bate a jot of heart or hope,” but bear on my way. Mankind, thou canst be saved only by crucified redeemers. Ay, it is so. The Cross is the true symbol of regeneration. He, who will go forth to defend the right, to plead for the poor and the neglected, the oppressed and the enslaved, must take up his cross and follow Jesus. He, who condemns the present, — and he, who demands reform, does condemn it, — must be himself condemned in return. The present attacks those by whom it is attacked. They are wolves in sheep’s clothing, they, the pretended reformers, who find wind and tide in their favor, and whose bark is wafted gently forward by the breath of popular applause. The future is elaborated in the present; but its elaborators must work in dark laboratories, silent retreats, or subterranean caverns, unseen, unknown, unvisited, uncheered, unaided. It cannot be otherwise. Christ must needs suffer. They are of the future, and the future must be their reward. Their views, their ideas, their wishes, their hopes are dark mysteries to their contemporaries. They are the prophets of a new age. The world is not worthy of them. There is no world for them. They must be the builders as well as the heralds of their own world. And while they seem to those around them but the mere pullers-down of the world, in which they appear, but to which they belong not, how can they excite any other shout than that of “crucify them, crucify them.”

And yet the cross is sometimes all but too heavy to be borne, and the firmest and stoutest faint beneath its weight. O, it is bitter to be cursed with thoughts beyond your age, to see truths invisible to all eyes but your own, to be compelled to utter prophecies you



know will not be credited, to be alone in the thronged city, a stranger in the home of your childhood, and amid faces familiar to you from your youth up. O this is a solitude in which a man agonizes, sweats as it were great drops of blood! Mankind, thou little knowest what it costs to save thee from thyself. No matter. Thou deservest to have martyrs, for thou art the child of God. But why talk I in this strain? you understand me not. I talk mysticism, fanaticism, or barbarism to your comprehension.

*C.* You are right now. All this stuff about what the Reformer suffers is all foolishness to me.

*R.* And so, Sir, must be all great truths, and pure philanthropy, and lofty enthusiasm, to you and to such as you. When you have felt a desire for human happiness, for the progress of mankind, so strong that you could not sleep; when you have given years of intense study to the means of doing good, and sacrificed wealth, ease, reputation, friends, and found yourself alone, considered by one a madman, and by another an imp of hell, and found that after all your exertions, no man understands you, no bosom responds with sympathy to the holy love struggling in your own, and that you must after all die, without having finished your work; then you may sneer at the Reformer, and call what he says foolishness; till then be silent, lest you be found blaspheming God.

### CONVERSATION III.

*C.* THERE is no ground for the distinction of which you speak. We are all workingmen. The lawyer, the physician, the clergyman, the merchant, the statesman, the philosopher works as hard, perhaps harder, than your ploughman, your ditcher, your carpenter, shoemaker, or blacksmith.

*R.* Admitted; but the difference is this, one class works to produce, the other class works to secure for itself the proceeds of the other's producing. The community is divided into two classes; one class,

which I denominate the workingmen, are producers, the other class are accumulators, of wealth. The first class create wealth, the second transfer it to their own pockets.

*C.* But there is one thing which you Radicals seem always to overlook. You either cannot or will not regard the aid which the producers receive from the skill, science, enterprise, and capital of those you call the accumulators. Your producers would be in a sad box, if they were deprived of the capital of the accumulators, and of their science to direct their mere brute labor. The labor of those heads, which to you seem idle, is doing more than all the labor of the hands of your producers, to facilitate the work of production.

*R.* But production for whom? These accumulators with their capital and their head-work, I know, multiply productions far exceeding in amount anything we could do by our mere hand-work; but who secure the profits? You, and all the economists with whom I am acquainted, seem to take it for granted, that the well-being of the producer is always in exact proportion to the amount of production; and they would be right, if every man produced for himself; but as things now are they are most sadly mistaken. The accumulators study to employ their science and capital in that manner which will give them the greatest profit; that is, so that they may derive the greatest possible amount of production from the labors of the producers. The advantages, to which you allude, then, of increased production, are advantages almost exclusively to the accumulators.

*C.* In point of fact, you are greatly out in your reckoning. The expense of manufacturing a yard of calico bears no comparison with what it was fifty years ago. A similar change has taken place in the expense of producing almost all the articles consumed by the common laborer; and do you mean to tell me the laborer has gained nothing by this cheapness of production, and this low price he has to pay for whatever he consumes? The laboring classes are in a condition

almost immeasurably above that in which they were at the epoch of our Revolution. To be assured of this, you need but compare the price of labor with that of bread stuffs then, and the price of labor with that of bread stuffs now. You may also be convinced of this by observing the houses, dress, and style of living of laborers now, which in many respects are superior to what those of the rich were then.

*R.* This mode of judging is fallacious. That there has been a general increase of wealth throughout the civilized world for the last forty or fifty years, nobody is fool enough to deny. Man's empire over Nature, during this period, has been greatly extended and consolidated; the powers of production of all kinds, as well as productions themselves, have been so multiplied as to baffle all efforts at calculation. The laboring classes most certainly account many things necessities of life now, which they then accounted its luxuries. But they are not the less poor. Poverty and wealth are merely relative terms. The only true method of judging of this matter is to ascertain whether the position of the producer, relatively to that of the accumulator, be higher or lower, than it was at the epoch of the Revolution, before the marvellous powers of machinery, of science, and capital had been made to bear on production, as they have been since. Grant that a yard of calico may be purchased now at an eighth of what it cost fifty years ago; what is gained, if in order to maintain the same relative social position, the blacksmith's wife must put seven yards more into her gown, or have eight gowns to one then? You know, Sir, if you know anything about it, that, notwithstanding the general advance of wealth and the vast multiplication of the necessities and conveniences of life, it is altogether more difficult for the common laborer to maintain the same social position now, than it was fifty years ago. The general style of living has more than kept pace with the increase of wealth. The mechanic, it may be, receives two and even three times as much, nominally, for his labor now as he did then, and is required

to pay two or three times less for what he purchases ; but then he must have as much more as this difference implies in order to be a man of the same consequence that he was. The blacksmith's wife must have a carpet now, where a nicely sanded floor was enough then ; and a French calico instead of a homemade, copperas-dyed, tow-and-linen gown, which was her pride then. Then she could spin and weave, and with butternut bark, dye her husband a coat from the wool he received for blacksmithing ; but now she can only do some fine needlework, and he can wear only broadcloth ; both of which things demand corresponding changes in the style of living.

*C.* And I should suppose that with your great affection for blacksmiths, and especially for blacksmiths' wives, you would rejoice that it is so.

*R.* No. My friends, the blacksmith and his wife, the shoemaker and his wife, the housewright, and the wheelright and their wives, are all poorer than they were. Their houses may look better outwardly, but they are not so comfortable inside. They have more compared with what they then had, but less compared with what is now the general style of living. The sanded floor, the copperas gown, the checked apron, the butternut coat, and tow shirt, frock, and trowsers, were good enough for them then, for they were as good as their neighbor's had. Some little vanity or uneasiness might now and then be occasioned by the quality, the skill of the housewife in making, in dying, or in fitting, but it amounted to very little. Each family manufactured for itself, and felt itself independent ; and the feeling of independence, that we have within ourselves the means of providing for our own wants, is worth more than all the carpets, French calicoes, French silk, satin, lace, and the like things in the world. Those were happy times. Labor was no disgrace, for all labored ; and homespun was no badge of inferiority, for all wore it. I remember how delighted I used to be when I was a boy, at evening, to seat myself on the dye-tub, which stood in the



corner, and hear the maid, who was doing our spinning, accompany the music of her wheel with such old songs as "Jemmy and Nancy," and "the Cruelties of Barbara Allen." I have heard some famous singers in my day; but no songs have ever charmed me like those old songs sung by our neighbor's daughter who did our spinning. What though she had but one calico gown for Sunday; what though that was often turned and altered to look unfaded and to be within hailing distance of the fashion; and what though she worked for forty cents a week, and had no gilt album or souvenir lying in her boudoir? She had health and cheerfulness, bloom on her cheek, an elastic bound in her step, heartiness in her laugh, witchery in her smile, and — was as good as any of us. It was no disgrace that "she went out to work." No young spark made any account of that. At all gatherings and merry-makings, her head was as high as any one's, and her chance for a worthy and respectable companion was as good as hers who never worked in or out of her father's house. Nobody complained of bad servants. The daughters of the best families would go and help the poorest, if they could be spared from home. Thus was it in one of thy mountain towns, my native State, in my young days. Then the hearts of thy children were as fresh as the verdure of thy mountains, and their spirits as free as the winds that sweep over them. I have seen many countries; I have visited lands most renowned in song or story; I have lived in cities, consorted with the great, and wedged my way into the charmed circles of the fashionable; but give me back the mountain home of my childhood, and let me hear again the wheel, and our neighbor's eldest daughter accompany the music of her spinning with the old songs of "Jemmy and Nancy," and "The Cruelties of Barbara Allen." In that home I was made a freeman. I drew in a love of equality with the milk from my mother's breast. There I learned to look on man, to see the man and not his clothes; and for this I bless thee, my native State.

Fame gives thee credit for no great men, but I know thou hast a great people, and my old Geography yet reads, and I hope not in vain, "Vermont is an independent State."

Forgive me, Sir, for this allusion to my native State, and to the home of my childhood. That home is changed now. The same blue sky bends over it, the same golden sun sheds its beams upon it; but old faces have gone, old manners have given way. The summer's stock of cloth no longer lies bleaching on the grass plat before the door; my sister is not there with her water-pot; and to the sound of the water-fall, and the spinning-maid's song, has succeeded the endless clack of the cotton mill.

C. You are a strange Radical. I knew not before that Radicals ever thought of the Past save to condemn it. I have always supposed that they had eyes only for the Future.

R. That is, you have supposed we were only half-men. This is a mistake. For my part, I love the ancient and the time-hallowed. I delight to stand on spots renowned in story; amid the fragments of earlier worlds, to conjure up the dread Spirit of the mighty Past, and question him concerning those who were, but are not. I never had even a cane that I had carried for a long time, a knife which had done me good service, that I could lose without a pang. But I have learned to sacrifice the Poetical to the Useful. I love the old oak which yet stands by the home of my childhood, under whose shade I have so often played when life was full, and by which I whispered the tale of my earliest and truest love; but I would cut it down sooner than I would see my children freeze, or want fuel to cook their food.

C. Then you would not really destroy our factories, demolish all our labor-saving machinery, and go back to the hand-cards, the hand-loom, the spinning-wheel, the spinning-maid, and the songs of Jemmy and Nancy and the Cruelties of Barbara Allen!

R. Not I. I would never go back. If I some-

times give a tear to the Past, it is never to evoke it from its tomb. No. Let it rest in peace. The Past which is revived is never the Past which lives in our memories. It is only the ideal Past that is venerable. Those old songs would not please me now. The bloom is no longer on the maiden's cheek who bounded at her wheel, and gone is the mischief from her eye, and the witchery from her smile. We have lost the religion of our youth. The fairies no longer keep holiday on the green knoll in the pasture, or pinch the milkmaid because she stints our supper. But I do not regret it. All changes in the end are proved to be steps forward in the march of Humanity. Yet the step we have taken during the last fifty years is shorter than we pretend. We have changed the mode of production; for our neighbor's daughter, who used to do my mother's spinning and weaving, who nursed her in her confinement, and who was one of us, good as the best in the neighborhood, we have now the pale and sickly factory girl, who must up at the ringing of a bell, eat and sleep at the ringing of a bell, obey the whistle of a petty overseer, never leave her jail limits without permission, and whose average working life is only about four years. The one was our equal, whom the sons of our best farmers were willing and often glad to marry, and the other can get her a husband among the factory population perhaps—but rarely elsewhere. She is only a *factory* girl, and you know what that means. And surely here is some loss,—a loss of health, cheerfulness, freedom, and social position; and what is gained to balance this loss? At best two dollars a week instead of forty cents, and which two dollars does less to satisfy her wants, than the forty cents did to satisfy the wants of the one who did our spinning. The difference between these two girls is the difference between the working classes of our country fifty years ago and now.

Yet, improvements have been effected, important inventions have been made and labor-saving machine-

ry introduced which abridges labor many thousand fold. As soon as the producers can so arrange matters as to produce for themselves, they will reap the full advantage of this labor-saving machinery, and of the increased capital of the country. At present they receive no direct profit from either. The accumulators reap the profits. This discloses the true aim of the Radical. His aim is not to produce equality in property, nor in anything else, but to make every man a proprietor, so that the producer and the accumulator shall always be united in the same person. To this point, I would have governments direct their attention; all the friends of the people should keep it in view, and all Legislative and educational measures should tend to it.

C. You have now stated your object clearly. I must think of it. And to-morrow I hope you will get the better of your sentimentalism, so far at least as not to talk nonsense.

#### CONVERSATION IV.

C. *YOUR* plan is more plausible than sound, and appears much better in theory than it will appear in practice. Division of labor is essential to the very existence of society. But your plan requires every man to do everything for himself.

R. Not at all. The shoemaker may stick to his last, and the blacksmith may work at his forge. All the division in labor now recognised, may continue under the regulation, that every man works for himself, as well as under our present arrangement. The only division of labor to which I object, is that which assigns the head-work to one part of the community, and the hand-work to another. Since man is both soul and body, I would have no division of body-work and soul-work. Both should be as inseparable as soul and body. In the present state of things all the soul-work devolves on a distinct class of the community, and they are treated as though they were all soul; all the body-



work falls to another class, and they are treated as though they were all body. But this is unnatural and unjust. The body-workers have souls as well as the soul-workers. They who do our hand-work are of the same order of being with those who do our head-work.

*C.* That is true. But still, it is a very great advantage to the hand-workers, to have the aid of the head-workers. This you Radicals seem to overlook. You complain bitterly, that those who work with their heads are rewarded for their labor. You are not willing to give any share of the fruits of hand-work to him, who by his inventions has given to your hands a hundred fold their natural strength. Brute labor is all that you seem to regard as worthy of compensation. The philosopher, the naturalist, the mechanician, the painter, the poet, the sculptor, the musician, soul-workers as they are, must not be paid for their labors, though without their labors, life would be hardly worth possessing.

*R.* Stop there, if you please. You mistake us greatly. We would have all these soul-workers paid. But soul-work always pays itself. If these soul-workers could have wherewithal to provide for the body, while they were at work with the soul, it would be all that they would demand. No man, who pursued his profession for the sake of money, was ever yet a great philosopher, or a great artist. My rule is, that soul must pay for soul, and body for body. I object to an exchange of the products of the one for those of the other. At present, necessity may demand the unholy barter; but when society becomes what it should be, it will be discontinued.

*C.* How then are these soul-workers, as you call them, to live? Are we to have no men of science, no philosophers, no artists?

*R.* Millions to one in comparison with what we now have, I hope; but you seem very slow of apprehension. I would have every man labor for himself on his own capital, and then every man would have the time to produce all that is needed for the body; and also as much as can be devoted with any degree of advantage to moral, intellectual, and æsthetical pursuits.

*C.* Are you sure of that?

*R.* Some nice calculators have ascertained that if all men would labor, each three hours a day, they would produce all the material goods which they would need, or which could be enjoyed by the body. Now any physiologist will tell you, that three hours' labor a day is no more than is needed for the health of the body; and any man, who has any acquaintance with mental pursuits, will assure you that six hours a day are as much as any man can profitably devote to them. He, who labors three hours a day and studies six, will make much greater progress, than he who studies nine and labors none at all. This would leave every man fifteen hours a day for refreshment, social intercourse, and sleep. Under such an arrangement, you see, every man would be able to devote all the time necessary to head-work, — to science, philosophy, poetry, music, painting, or sculpture. There would then be no need of a separate class for these pursuits, to be paid out of the hand-work of the rest.

*C.* I suppose then you would not pay the clergy, physicians, lawyers, nor public officers?

*R.* No. They would need no pay. Each one would give three hours a day to labor as a matter of exercise, for health; and that would produce him all he would need for his body. His other labors being mental, would be recompensed by a mental reward. Besides, in this case, clergymen would not be needed; every man would know the Lord for himself, and be his own priest. Physicians would hardly be needed; for temperance and proper exercise would maintain almost uninterrupted health. Lawyers would not be in much request; for roguery would then hardly exist, and public officers would have but little employment.

*C.* Upon my word, you are a beautiful dreamer! And how do you expect to realize this dream?

*R.* As I have told you, by having every man do his own hand-work and head-work.

*C.* And you suppose the workingmen, mere brute

laborers, can become intellectual beings, philosophers, learned men, artists.

*R.* Why not? Are not we of the same order of being with those who think themselves above us? We care not with what contempt they look upon us, nor how contemptuously they sneer at our hopes for the future; we know that our bosoms burn, and our eyes sparkle with a fire as pure and as eternal as that which they bid us worship in their idol temples. Of the dust of the earth we indeed are, and down-trodden to the dust too we long have been; but we are also the offspring of God, and upward to our Father and our native heaven we may rise.

*C.* You have, for six thousand years, given brave proofs of your celestial origin! One would think that in so long a series of ages your inward fire might have been kindled into a blaze.

*R* Full many a gem of purest ray serene  
The dark, unfathomed caves of ocean bear;  
Full many a flower is born to blush unseen,  
And waste its sweetness on the desert air.

And beware, Sir, how you add insult to injury. You put out our eyes and reproach us for our blindness; make us blind and then tell us we shall tumble into the ditch, unless we have somebody to lead us. In our mother's arms the fire of intellect is smothered, and you and your caste keep watch by us ready to dash on your pail-fulls of cold water whenever a symptom of its revival is discovered. Now that we have been kept in ignorance, deprived of the means of developing our powers, and obliged to conceal the God laboring in our breasts under the veil of idiocy, you have the effrontery to mock us because we are not philosophers, and to tell us that we must work hard to pay you for your great condescension in thinking for us; and you might add, for condescending to be happy for us. Base hypocrites! We understand you. We will not trust you to do our thinking; for we are suspicious, that your thinking is much more to your profit than to ours. Your thinking for us amounts

to little else than how to make us work to the best advantage, while you shall pocket the proceeds. You are fond of extolling the importance of head-work; but, as we have learned, that you may contrive to get your living without working at all. For you do not think as much, nor do you turn out to be such profound thinkers, as you pretend. Most of the discoveries of which you boast, and inventions and improvements in the arts of production, from which you derive so much profit, are the result of *our* thinking; and nearly all the individuals, who have saved your body from putrefaction, have been supplied from our ranks. We comprehend you; and hereafter will endeavor to do our own thinking; and if we think not so much to your interest as you have done, we may think perhaps more to our own, which will be still better.

C. In most of your remarks you labor under a mistake. You seem to believe that there is a class in this country hostile to the workingmen, seeking to circumvent them, and to keep them from rising. All this is mere fancy. I can speak for myself, and I think for all of those whom you brand as aristocrats, that nothing would give them or me more sincere pleasure than to see the workingmen all in comfortable circumstances. We have no pleasure in poverty, no delight in seeing, and certainly none in causing human suffering. You do us great injustice, and you do a serious injury to the workingmen themselves. You stir up their jealousies, excite their hostility against those you call the accumulators, and throw the whole community into a state of intestine war. Now this is no way to bring about a reform. The rich are necessary to the poor, and the poor are necessary to the rich, and as the friend of either class, you should seek to make both live together as brothers.

R. The lamb is necessary to the wolf; for without the lamb the wolf might want a dinner; and the wolf is necessary to the lamb, for without the wolf the lamb might fail to be eaten. "Therefore," says the benevolent wolf to the lamb, "do not be hostile to



us, nor excite your brother lambs against us; for you see we wolves and you lambs are mutually necessary to each other. We are as dependent on you for something to eat, as you are on us to be eaten." "But I don't want to be eaten," exclaims the lamb in great trepidation. "Not want to be eaten!" replies the wolf. "Now that's odd. You and I are very far from thinking alike, and I must needs consider you very unreasonable, and radical in your mode of thinking."

*C.* Do you mean to call the rich wolves?

*R.* Apply my comparison as you please. All I mean is that the reasoning of the wolf appears to me as conclusive and every whit as just as yours.

*C.* I anticipated nothing of this from you, who evidently have had the means of knowing better. Some ignorant workingman might have been pardoned for talking so, but you, whoever or whatever you are, have seen too much of the rich to believe any such thing as you assert. You must have some base and sinister purpose in supporting the workingmen. You have some personal pique to gratify, and I no longer believe you honest but mistaken, as I did at first.

*R.* As you please. I profess to have no control over your opinions. You are not the first man whom the truth has offended, and will not be the last. But be cool. Now I know the rich; I know the accumulators of wealth in this country and in most others, and it is because I know them that I speak as I do.

*C.* If you continue to talk thus, I must break off the conversation, and relieve myself of your company.

*R.* As it suits your pleasure. I neither court nor avoid any man. But listen a moment. Now I have not the most distant suspicion that there is a class among us that wishes to keep down the workingmen, or that wills their poverty. The rich have no disposition to injure the poor. They are not hostile to the poor. The wolf does not by any means dislike the lamb, or wish to injure it. He only wants a dinner, and lamb is his most agreeable food. He loves lamb most affectionately.

*C.* No more of that, Sir.

*R.* Well, well, Sir, I see you do not like the comparison; you probably are afraid of the consequences. The wolf —

*C.* I tell you I will hear no more of that.

*R.* Very well, Sir. I only wanted to say that, the wolf might be afraid, if the lambs should once know that they were necessary to the wolf only for the purpose of furnishing him dinners, and that he was necessary to them only for the purpose of eating them, that they might, as they probably have no great desire to be eaten, combine against him, and thus leave him to feed on something else; but as it is disagreeable to you, I won't say it. And besides the wolf must be very foolish to apprehend any danger from a combination among the lambs. What could they do against the wolf? By combining they would only give him an opportunity to make his dinner on the fattest instead of the leanest. But seriously, Sir, your talk about the necessity of the rich to the poor is all a humbug, and fully justifies my comparison. The poor are necessary to the rich, I admit; but that the rich are necessary to the poor, I deny; and you know they are not, as you testify by your dread of my saying so. It is out of no love to the poor, no tender regard for their welfare, that you wish to have it understood that the rich are necessary to them.

*C.* You seem to think that we are a set of selfish wretches, who detest the poor and do all we can to make them miserable.

*R.* No, I do not. I acquit you of all hostility to the poor. I am even willing to admit that you have a certain affection for them, and would do your best to preserve and multiply them.

*C.* Come, cease your pleasantries, and speak seriously.

*R.* I am serious, and speak with all the truthfulness I can command. The wolf certainly has no disposition to destroy the race of lambs. Nor do I blame the wolf for making his dinner of lamb. It is his nature to do it. Nor do I blame the accumulator for transfer-

ring the profits of the workingman's labor into his own pockets. It is his nature to do it. He could not be an accumulator if he did not. What I complain of is that there are wolves, or accumulators of wealth, separate from the producers of wealth. In sober earnest, you can assign but two reasons why the rich are necessary to the poor; one reason is that they may be the *instructors of the poor*, and the other that *they may give them employment*. Have you any other reasons to allege?

C. Those are enough.

R. But we have disposed of these already, by contending that the poor should do their own thinking, and also work for themselves. There is no good reason in the world to be assigned, why one class of the community should be dependent on another for its instructors. The whole community may and should be equally educated, and every man may and should work for himself. So long as the wealth of the community is in the hands of only a certain number of individuals; or, in other words, so long as the community is divided into two classes, one of which owns the funds, and the other of which must perform the labor of production, the poor are undoubtedly dependent on the rich for employment; and since without employment, the poor must beg, steal, or starve, the rich may be said to be necessary to them. But this is the precise evil I complain of in the present social arrangement of wealth and labor. Let each man become an independent proprietor, and then the rich would not be necessary to the poor, in order to give them employment, for each man could employ himself on his own capital, and instead of working for another he could work for himself.

C. Every man does work for himself now. I do not know what you mean by this senseless clatter about every man's working for himself on his own capital. Every man does so work now. One man's capital is his farm, his workshop, or his store and goods, another's his ability to labor, the strength and activity of his limbs. In the great copartnership of society

each man invests his capital, whatever it be, and receives his share of the gains. Some invest more than others, and therefore receive and ought to receive a proportionally larger share. You and I too form a co-partnership when I employ you as a common laborer to plough, plant, hoe, or reap for me. You are not indeed an equal partner. Your investment is less than mine. You invest merely your bodily strength and activity, while I invest house, barn, out-houses, land, oxen, horses, sheep, and hogs, together with my own labor, bodily or mental. Now as my investment is more than yours, I ought to receive a larger portion of the gains. Your share is called your wages, and when you consider that in copartnerships of this kind, I have all the vexation and labor of superintending the joint concern, that I have to pay all the incidental expenses, run all the risk, and be responsible for all the debts, and to you also for your share, I think that you must admit that your wages amount to your full proportion. Certain it is, that many an employer would do well to exchange places with those he employs. They in fact often run away with all the gains, and seldom suffer when the concern is a losing one.

This matter of wages, about which workingmen have so much to say, is, after all, a thing beyond human control. A stern and unyielding necessity governs it. There is a natural ratio established between wages and the price of articles demanded for consumption, which no power on earth can alter. If wages rise, articles of consumption rise in the same proportion; if wages fall, then articles of consumption fall. Let the workingmen double their wages, and what they gain on the one hand they will find they lose on the other. They will have to pay double for everything they consume. When masons, and carpenters, and house-joiners rise in their wages, house-rent will rise; when house-rent rises real estate will rise in value, land will bear a higher price, and of course the productions of the soil. Flour must rise; the baker then will ask more for his loaf or make it lighter; and



when the shoemaker must pay more for his bread, he will charge more for his shoes, and so it will be with all the trades. This shows in a clear light the fallacy of Strikes, Trades' Unions, and all combinations of workingmen for higher wages, which are seldom successful ; and when they are, amount to nothing. In the transition from one price to another, the trade which gets the start of the rest may gain something, but as soon as one trade rises, all the rest will rise, and then things are as they were before. When a day's work will buy a bushel of wheat, and only a bushel, it makes no difference whether you call the price of a day's work sixpence or five dollars.

Ignorance of this fact does great harm. Mechanics in our cities become uneasy, they spend a portion of their earnings in the grog-shops, in oyster-cellars, in houses of prostitution, or in theatres, and finding what remains too little for their necessary expenses, they cry out for more wages, put the business part of the community to great inconvenience, often embarrassing them seriously, and subjecting themselves to loss of time and of money, when even were they to succeed nothing would be gained. No, Sir ; these things must be left to take care of themselves. The partner who has the smaller investment must not expect to share equally with him who has the larger, much less to possess himself, as the workingmen seem to desire, of all the profits of the firm. Let the workingmen limit their desires to what is their due, and they will have justice done them ; but if they can be satisfied only by having their share, and that which belongs to the other members of the firm into the bargain, then I must for one resist them, and if I fail, society will fail to exist.

Sir, let me beseech you to bear this in mind. A laboring man's capital is his bodily strength and activity, a kind of capital which is essential to the co-partnership, but which is only an item and a small item in the immense amount invested. What that is entitled to out of the general gains let him have. He

works on his own capital and has what he produces ; with that let him be satisfied. Nobody wishes to wrong him. Tell him so, use your eloquence to persuade him to be virtuous, economical, to avoid haunts of dissipation, to keep clear of the theatre and bawdy-houses, and you will do him a real service and deserve well of the whole community. Then you would prove yourself the workingman's true friend. I beseech you to do so, and forbear to say or do ought to stir up the laboring classes against the rich. Your present language makes me believe you a dangerous man. I beseech you to use a different language hereafter.

---

ART. II. — *The Times, — Past, Present, and Future. Factions, Religious and Political. The English System and Catholicism. The English System in America. Democracy. Its Tendency. Result.*

FACTION, or that species of political party which has no direct relation either to philosophical truth, or practical measures, has had a sort of festival triumph, in the recent general election, which may well terminate its deceptive and worthless career. An old, well known, though always an ephemeral spirit, has had another day's fluttering and revel. The vacant lust of conquest, which necessarily reduces political contests to mere efforts at official ascendancy, has now done, it may be hoped, all it can do to corrupt the public mind, and expel from the current history of the time its rightful dignity. Politics, that, like religious feeling, should be the serious study of a free and intelligent people, has, under this pernicious influence, been made a mere sportive exercise, while its belligerent means have been contemptibly trifling. Citizens, free and sovereign by name, have for a few years past openly leagued together for specific partial

or selfish purposes ; the two great parties of the country have been but agglomerations of small ones, and neither has had other than a remotely constructive relation to the fundamental principles of human difference and concord.

As factional religion, or *Sectarism* as it is sometimes called, early prostrated the power of the Reformation, and left the greater part of the civilized world unaffected by the new spirit, so has factional politics often interrupted, and long delayed the social regeneration of the world. The restless activity of mind must be employed ; the individual passion for excitement must have its appropriate food, and men will ever rally under a false and deceptive banner when that of principle is furled. From this inherent frailty of human nature, acted upon by the artful misrepresentation of Truth, which is the handiwork of the missions of Injustice, have originated the whole class of local and transient revolutions, that grossly disfigure the history of the past ; complicate and confuse the great current of consequential changes in the social condition of mankind, and render the Philosophy of Politics most difficult and profound.

Never since the beginning of evil have appearances more belied reality than at the present time. Peace is said to reign over the Earth, and yet everywhere, there is war in disguise ; smothered indeed, or kept in a sort of half-way existence, by unintermitted and ever fluctuating diplomacy, but as grinding to the nations, and as foreign to repose and prosperity, as honest, open, and destructive battle. The United States are proclaimed free and independent, severed from all colonial relation to the Government of England, while we are quite as dependent upon, fully as tributary to, and as sensibly affected by her institutions as any one of her now existing colonies, or as we were before the declaration of our independence. The time was, when men did not greatly err in estimating the strength of

nations by the extent of their respective navies, and the numbers of their armies; but the systematic policy of Great Britain,—“the English System”—the concentration of the money-power of the world in London, in close affinity with the administration of her Government, is an overwhelming power that armies and navies cannot measure;—a power that has had no prototype in the world, save in that awful reign of terror which existed before the combined spiritual and temporal supremacy of Rome was overthrown by Luther and the Reformation.

The analogy between the old Pontifical Power and the present English System is closer than is generally supposed. If we but substitute the avarice of the one, for the superstition of the other; the ardent love of money, for the extreme fear of death and hell,—passions equally absorbing and all-controlling in their dominion over men,—we may comprehend this analogy in its aggregate and details. False, corrupt, ingenious, magnificent, the two systems alike claim our hatred and admiration, and justify the shaking of the Earth itself for the riddance of the immense imposition. The wielding of the “spiritual power,” when that power was exercised upon the extreme mental feebleness of the world, itself the product of art and design, and the concentration of that power at the Vatican, was not more oppressive, tyrannical, and unjust, than the corresponding control now exercised upon a wide basis of artificial poverty and cultivated meanness, emanating, through the arts and mysteries of commerce, from the Banking conclave of London. The funding and banking centres of the English policy may be aptly compared to those old, and now worn out institutions of the once predominant church, the ecclesiastical and monastic orders. As superior worth and *sanctity* were claimed by, and accorded to the old associations, so we find a similar worth and *wealth* accredited to the new; and as falsely in the one case as it ever was in the other. Ignatius Loyola, in founding the formidable



Society of the Jesuits, did but bank a vast portion of the superstition or belief of the world ; and established for the members and their friends, an immense credit in social reputation, and unbounded influence over the temporal interests of men. The Inquisition, even when in the plenitude of its tyranny and abominations, did but make and break whom its capitalists listed ; and dispensed the peculiar poverty of that time, as our money cheiftains do the peculiar poverty of ours. The worldly destinies of a freeman, deserving of independence, should be in the power of himself or his kind alone ; but where is the man, nominally free or emphatically a slave, who does not obey the subtle and all-pervading influence of the monks of the Order of — Money !

It is a vague definition of civilized man to say he is an intelligent being, governed by opinions, which result in laws. Far better it is to respect history and experience, which prove he is governed by passion, which results in instability. Hope is inseparable from moral existence, and enthusiasm is the basis of energy and enterprise. The gaudy, mystified, and ever varying piety of former ages, signified nothing but a certain greedy and insatiable want in the human mind of something indefinitely extravagant. Accordingly, all modern history comprises little else than a series of successive public excitements, singularly incongruous and contrarious in their natures, but each, in its turn, claiming and obtaining the homage of the world. It would indeed seem as if nearly all the possible phases and combinations of intoxicated feelings had already reigned their time and passed into oblivion. Since Roman pride gave way before savage destructiveness, the world has been successively enslaved, the great popular mass cruelly degraded ; *first*, by the devoted and captivating bravery of the Feudal ages, which wore itself out by extending beyond the sublime and running errant to the ridiculous ; *secondly*, by the high-wrought organization of the Church, involving all the

machinery of Terror, and which, in its turn, exploded through the extreme refinement of its immunities and oppressions; *thirdly*, by the era of Glory in the long series of promiscuous wars growing out of the Reformation, generally unworthy in their origin and contemptible in their objects, and which, as the others, has become stale, flat, and unprofitable. It has well nigh wholly yielded to the *fourth* excitement, the organization of the Money Power; the contraction of all human interests within the circles of avarice and meanness; the glittering kingdom of commerce; the conversion of principles and feelings — of “men and the souls of men,” into commodities of merchandise. An organization more delusive and oppressive to the many; more gratifying and exalting to the few, than any that have preceded it; but which, happily, contains in its very nature a rottenness and inevitable decline, that must soon transfer it among its kindred wonders of the Past. It must of necessity give way. The new social spirit, or reigning passion, which is to supplant it, is already born into existence. The passionate love of Liberty; the wild spirit of Democracy will, for a time, overspread, engross, and control all human society. In itself, not the, or any part of the millennium, but involving progress and reform; conclusive as to the dynasty of fictions, and the harbinger era of Peace and Reality.

The specific contest, then, in which the whole world is engaged, is the only one appropriate to the present time, — between the Money power and the Democratic. These are now the antagonist systems, and for the one or the other must every man contend. It is vain to attempt neutrality, or idly await the arrival of a better proposition than either of these involves. They and we are here upon the battle ground, without choice of time, or selection of opponents beyond the single alternative. Preference may, however, be in some measure governed by careful inquiry into the respective systems.

The Money Power, or "English system," so called, because its central home, or *point d'appui*, is evidently in the capital of England, contemplates success, *first*, by the perfection of its own machinery, and *secondly*, by preventing, or greatly retarding, the growth of the democratic spirit. Under the first head, it is assumed that London or England can become the exclusive home of the wealth, magnificence, and power of the world; while all other nations must become largely tributary to her, through the operations of her monetary system. Allowing to all other sections of the earth entire nominal independence, as far less expensive and troublesome to herself than their actual dependence, England has adopted the deep-laid scheme of over influencing foreign nations, by means of her own emissaries and minions in their midst. Like the pouring forth by the olden Romish power of hordes of indefatigable missionaries into distant governments, and thereby accomplishing the gradual, quiet, insidious subjugation of their people to the "spiritual supremacy," the whole world is now filled with interested and servile advocates of the English policy; and its total conversion, — equally quiet and insidious, — to the supremacy of wealth, is in frightful progress. It has ever been a customary species of lordly policy, — no matter what be the reigning passion, — for the purpose of obtaining influence, to induce the more humble to depend for their hope upon the superfluous means of others. The partaking of the concentrated holiness of the old Catholic Church, involved the abject subjection of the confiding individual. The subdivision of the glory of the Military Chieftains proved to be the total sacrifice of the common soldier; and in like manner, the *ideal good* of the present system is ingeniously diffused for the tribute and subjection of mankind. A hypocritical generosity is now ever ready to lend money to a moderately independent farmer, for the extension of his lands, or the renewal of his buildings; which generally terminates in the sacrifice of all he has. This common, old, and essentially dishonest process is the

elementary basis of the general policy of England. Vastly extended, and accurately systematized, it has become the mighty engine for founding universal empire ; — a project, chimerical to sober reflection, but too fascinating to minds excited by avarice, not to be faithfully tried and ardently hoped for.

Many millions of wealth has England already thus invested in these United States alone. The apparent or ostensible amount is grossly deceptive. There is no possibility of estimating the loans she has made to private individuals and firms in business, or the extent of her interest, as at least silent or special partner, in the trade, manufactures, and even the real estate of the country. We well know, however, that the visible owners of these things exhibit all the anxiety in behalf of the English capitalists, that especial friends or partners can in any case do, and are evidently in some sort of associate interest with them. The manifest and great desire of the money missionaries, the English partners and stipendiaries among us, for vast schemes of expensive "internal improvements," and for the institution of banks and incorporations generally, means something, means much. England yearns to loan us money. Her system restrains her within no contracted limits. She has never yet had near scope enough to exhibit to us or the world, the full wonders and mysteries of her policy. So much of fiction, so much of mere empty appearance and trick are in the practical nature of these loans, that allow to English capital circulation enough ; give it Jehu-like celerity, and a close observer would be amazed at the amplified fiscal properties of but a few millions of coin. Money, in large sums, may be said to possess a highly elastic property, by which it returns to its original home with a rapidity utterly incomprehensible to dealers in cents and farthings. The government of England owes her own capitalists nearly one thousand millions of pounds sterling, which she cannot and never will repay. Is her credit at all thereby impaired, or the means of her



moneyed men thereby crippled? Not at all. That immense debt has but resulted in a claim, by the rich few, of a vast annual income out of the taxes, — out of the labor of the country. It has become nothing more nor less than a peculiar pension list, peculiar only because negotiable in the market, while the basis of that debt, the same money, has been loaned over and over again, at home and abroad, without becoming in any degree impaired. Circulation, — including the theory and handiwork of exchanges, deposits, credits, drafts, paper obligations, &c., — is the corner stone of the fictitious and bloated wealth of England; that is to say, is the whole force of “the English system.”

It is no new idea that the immense national debt of England has strengthened her Government; or, in other words, rivetted the chains of despotism upon her miserable and infatuated people; — thence the doctrine, so palpably consistent with the whole English system, that “a national debt is a national blessing.” Conservative reliance has in all preceding epochs been reposed in some analogous and equally absurd fiction. In Catholic times, an enormous and thoroughly organized National Church, and in the reign of Glory, a huge and well disciplined army, respectively afforded this consolidated “blessing” of the individually wretched. There is truly nothing just now practicable, that can so effectually bind men or nations in ostensibly peaceful or commercial intercourse, as the relation of debtor and creditor, especially when deeply and permanently fixed, or when many individuals in a given section of society are similarly involved or interested. If we but imagine that in our own country *one third* of the population are indebted to England, by a complex series of primary, secondary, ternary, &c. obligation, which means hope of forbearance or farther indulgence, and duly appreciate the incomparably abject servitude of debt, we can comprehend something of the numbers, vast energy, and dreadfully threatening aspect of the *British political party* in our midst. To

assert that there are here already, directly and indirectly, so many as one third of the people, who are the confirmed subjects of the English system, may indeed be extravagant, and, if literally true, would be appalling. But to this end, and worse, must it come at last, unless met now, and perseveringly combatted to extinction, by all those who yet have the spirit as well as the name of freemen. Unitedly, in firm and compact mass, must the democracy of the land bear down upon the collective policy of England, as their one mighty and only important enemy, or the day of possible victory may pass away, and the dark night arrive in which no man can work.

It is not only from the emissaries and dependents of the British system that our liberties are in imminent danger:—there are among us chiefs as well as minions of the Money Power. Not a few of our citizens—and calling themselves Democratic Republicans!—with spurious patriotism and perverted judgment, would, at this late day, attempt to rival the commercial ascendancy of England, and establish here at home the throne of the money god. Without reflecting that England has irrecoverably the start of us in the gambling game, or that the result must necessarily be horribly evil to mankind, no matter where be the central position of the machinery,—of no more consequence now, than the residence of the Popes at Rome or at Avignon was in the spiritual system—they still vainly hope for success by an unwieldy extension of the English policy. The result of their endeavors, after many years of trial, has very naturally been to second or aid, instead of to weaken or divert from, the foreign project. In this way did our peculiar banking system, and paper money circulation originate, and in this way have they well nigh terminated:—A business policy which has made this new and plentiful land, a “high prices” country; a region of extreme artificial inflation in all its social features; and which would early have exploded into thin air, or

indeed could never have had being, but for the vast recipient wilderness of the west, which has kindly received from our more commercial border a vast and continuous procession of the expelled and ruined. Were it not for this boundless and geographical resource, those who are put *hors du combat* in the incessant cutting and slashing of the wide and ungovernable fluctuations of our business relations, would long since have so clogged the humbler vocations of society, as to have rendered the whole people incomparably miserable. This resource, because it is geographical, is contingent or adventitious, and can have no favorable bearing upon the justice or expediency of our paper policy. Instead of being a motive to the adoption of, or perseverance in the system, it clearly shows it is wrong in its nature, and, if persisted in, must eventually prove the bane of our yet happy institutions. That nature herself has, as it were, come to our aid, with a comparatively free and exhaustless garner of sustenance, when we have so conducted as to be unable to sustain ourselves on her usual supplies to nations, surely indicates that we have defeated by public mismanagement, the ordinarily successful results of industry and skill. Notwithstanding the high nominal rates of wages and productions, our industrial classes—even the freeholding agriculturalists—exhibit to the moral observer that peculiar phenomenon of a poor and oppressed people—children and most endeared friends generally parting from parents and each other, to emigrate to distant regions of fairer promise; and to flee from a country already worn out, not surely by a single century of cultivation, but by a false system of public institutions:—a country fertile and favored, when abstractedly compared with any other on Earth, yet cursed by errors of monetary policy, while its population is yet sparse, and the half of its original forests yet unfelled.

There is no other possible meaning to a paper circulating medium, than the production of High Prices.

The whole scope, bearing, or philosophy of the American *pseudo* policy has been to create a highly excited condition of social intercourse, in which extreme vicissitude shall be the predominant feature. Accordingly, a reckless spirit of speculation and gambling already presides over, not only the personal vocations of our citizens, but coerces, or threatens to coerce all the social, political, and even religious relations of the community. This direful excitement of public character; — the accurate parallel of that high-wrought zeal, which, three hundred years ago, employed the torture, the stake, and the sword to control religious belief and conduct — compels all our people to roll within the vortex of its influence, and each one to do the like of all, or die. The system of High Prices involves the decree, that success in life shall attend those only who largely participate in the excessive activity — the mad<sup>d</sup>ened fury of the times. Plain, routinal industry; the honest desire to live modestly and peaceably, is identified with folly or imbecility; for the common law is imperious, to get rich, emigrate, or perish. This chief immoral consequence, apparent already in the yet imperfect stage, will, if the system be carried out to its legitimate extent, as but too many desire, eventually startle the moralist and the christian, by exemplifying the yet poetic ideas of demoniac character, and the wallowing of the damned in perpetual fire. This language involves no exaggeration; it is the true “likeness of the spirit” of high prices. If one but cursorily looks into the authentic histories of nations, — notwithstanding that, like almost all the literature of the world, its authors and publishers were ever, as they are now, under the pay or patronage of the aristocracy, — he will find abundant proofs of the desperate and abominable means, uniformly resorted to in all the high excitements of society, to attain to influence or greatness. The *whys* and *wherefores* of the accession of many of the Roman Emperors in ancient times, and of many even of the holy Popes in modern, sufficiently demonstrate that the full maturity of any specific and reigning passion, is re-



plete with public depravity. A similar result will inevitably attend the climax of the money reign, provided it goes on unchecked by revolution, when the merely questionable, or conventionally tolerated means now employed to become wealthy, will, by regular increments of ever growing obtuseness in the public moral sense, have given place to modes and schemes, at which, at this day, avowed gamblers would recoil, and society revolt with a marked unanimity. The philosophic mind has but to suppose the inflation of the paper system to the double of what it ever yet has been, and then reflect upon the immense consequent widening of social disparity between those who have something of the wealth of this world, and those who have nothing, and the whole proposition will be satisfactorily solved. The factitious multiplication of the property or capital of a country, is but the real augmentation of its poverty; for the influential position of man in society is altogether relative. Under the supposition our western states and Texas would indeed populate with a rapidity many times greater than at any former period, and be falsely adduced as evidence — clear as proofs of Holy Writ — of wonderous national prosperity, while we, here at home, might flatter ourselves with perhaps five dollars a day for ordinary labor, but in reality be poor indeed: the nation of the poor, wherein the least poor would be the wealthiest man; himself the abject vassal of a foreign Lord.

But, the intemperance or immorality of the High Prices system, may, unhappily, appear to many as a matter of little importance; more especially since a complacent *Theology* has kindly devised an altogether abstract hypothesis, for quieting the conscience in a worldly mind. To those, therefore, who see no heinous evil in the general moral degradation of society, the argument can be presented, with possibility of effect, only in connexion with the selfishness or interest of the public. Still, it must be remarked, that even in this point of view, moral degradation — a

spurious sense of weakness, and awe of conventional superiority — is at the very foundation of the poverty and endurance of the people. By this, as the first cause, we can alone account for the empty parade and the assumed grandeur of the ascendent few, and the tacit assent of the humbled many to the whole, or any specific part, of the vast fabric of imposition. Even the artful cultivation of petty and enfeebling jealousies, by the institution of innumerable little distinct sects and associations in general society, results in this one common antecedent of social evils, the humility of the mass. In fact, the great contest before us is, when expressed in the simplest terms, the collective powers of moral debasement, on the one side, and the self-respect of the many on the other. Nevertheless, it is clearly not for the general interest, even when viewed in the meaner and mercenary sense, that the community should acquiesce in a system, by which the capitalists of England are rapidly increasing their levies of annual income upon the productive industry of the country; and by which the hold of her government upon our popular power, by means of the number of her dependents, is progressively augmenting; and must eventually, if allowed to continue, annul the spirit, and defeat the intent of our nearly universal suffrage; — the pride and boast of freemen, and apparently the last hope of the suffering world.

The paper system, however it may have originated with, or is supported by those who, vainly and viciously, hope for the eventual ascendancy of our own wealthy, in the general money excitement of the world, has already resulted in greatly strengthening and assuring the English supremacy. Our inflated circulation, and consequent high prices, has rendered America not only the principal, but the essentially important market for the sale of English natural as well as manufactured products. Without this market, and, of course, without our system of finance upon which it depends, the policy, hopes, and even the national insti-

tutions of England would fall to the ground. It is plainly confessed by the manifest zeal of her friends in our midst, that one great dread of that government is the overthrow, on this side of the Atlantic, of the paper system. This is too plain to need other demonstration, than to recall to mind the late protracted contest, between the money power and the democratic power, in relation to a United States Bank. Whatever specious and ingenious arguments were then employed by the advocates of a great national "regulator" of the currency, the primary meaning or object of their efforts was the perpetuation, if not the still greater expansion, of our fiscal policy. It is a truth too palpable for doubt, and too simple for argument; in other words, it is a political axiom, conceded by the sensitiveness of the whole monarchical and aristocratical world, that the permanence of our Federal constitution, in its restricted and *State Rights* character, will eventually, and by increasingly rapid strides, prove fatal to the false notions of right and wrong upon which all other governments are founded. It has, therefore, become imperiously necessary for the spirit of those governments, to combat, and if possible destroy the spirit of ours. The means of war or conquest have passed away with the exit of Napoleon from the field of the world; and the age of trickish diplomacy is waning as a petty and ludicrous episode, between the last and the present eras. There is, therefore, no resource left to the old species of governments, but the fashioning of our policy according to their will, by means of the creation and support of a political party in the country itself; which, by all the wiles of false professions, and the arts of deception, may possibly obtain a permanent ascendancy of numbers. By whatever feasible means, however, the general democratic tendency of our institutions must, as a matter of life or death, be checked by English influence or power. Therefore it is that we ever find some immense *lever*, — more specious and threatening than, though, as the end must prove, as preposterous as that of Archimedes, for overturning

the liberties of our people, is constantly in the employ of the British emissaries. A United States Bank was, for a long time, a hopeful means of this sort in their hands; but this form of the scheme has emphatically failed. The project of a great national bank seems now to be abandoned, as an exploded concern; the renewal of the discussion of which would full probably revive that overwhelming unity of democratic action, by which the late series of attempts were dissipated as political trifles.

Nothing daunted, however, by this total defeat, but on the contrary, rendered desperate by the threatening aspect of their own domestic concerns, the government and capitalists of England have promptly adopted another, and, it is to be feared, more dangerous plan for the demolition of our free institutions:—a plan, based upon the misdirection, or leading astray, of the rife passion for liberty. England has recently thrown into the midst of our peaceful family of sovereign States, the fire-brand of discord, in the shape of the question of SLAVERY. That infamous government, deeply sunk in all the hideous immoralities of the money excitement; and which holds millions of her own subjects, the whole of miserable Ireland, and hordes of wretched Asiatics, in a condition for which slavery were a mild and charitable name, has, with diabolical hypocrisy, freed her black slaves, in petty districts of her domains bordering on our country; and this with the concurrence of her subtle capitalists! He who can look at the aggregate policy of that government; at her systematic opposition to liberal principles at home and abroad, and who appreciates the savage,—the murderous spirit of money-intoxicated minds, and yet, can seriously pronounce the word *humanity* in connexion with this artful move of the law mongers and fund mongers of England, must be dead to every sense of justice and right reason. Humanity may yet sometimes be an individual sentiment, but all history is false, if it has ever been an aristocratic mo-



tive. Policy, and policy alone, profound, comprehensive, and entirely consistent, is at the foundation of the scheme; and its chief bearing and intent is to weaken, if not destroy, the union of our States, and thereby to effect the suppression of Democracy. The strenuous agitation of this, in itself narrow and contemptible question, — which is like the tithing of mint, and annise, and cummin, and forgetting far weightier matters, — will, at the least, so far serve the foreign purpose, as to wean, for a while, the public mind in the United States from other, and to our enemies tormenting reforms. In this way they may hope that even the anti-bank feeling will retrograde, and another mammoth money institution slip into existence. They may even expect to far transcend all their pre-existing contrivances in this country, by feeding to high sectional exasperation this false and misdirected excitement. At all events, the project promises to be counter-revolutionary in its tendencies; and however uncertain in its results, is therefore flattering to the devotees of ancient impositions.

The doctrine of the independent sovereignty of the States, in all things not expressly conceded to the Federal government by the Constitution of the Union, is the fundamental principle of the Republic; the whole sum and meaning of the Constitution itself. The failures of all former attempts at republican government on earth, are justly attributable to their consolidated, or singly national character. We have long been taught, and sufficiently, that such is the tendency of nations to assimilate in their institutions, — a tendency much increased in modern times, by the extension of commercial relations, — that no *one* people, with a widely peculiar form of government, can long preserve their peculiarities. Again, it is equally an historical truth, that even when several such governments, somewhat similar in form and proximate in locality, are not firmly allied for mutual peace and safety, they must either successively fail, from the external moral or coercive influences, or become extinct through jealousies and

contests among themselves. And truly, when we reflect on the very natural law, in all consolidated nations, whereby "power is constantly stealing from the many to the few," until it results in monarchy or revolution, we cannot wonder at the fate of the ancient Republics, or too much admire the inherently safe structure of ours. Our Union, which is one from, or out of many—" *E Pluribus Unum* "—is fortified by all those necessary "checks and balances," which coequal sovereignties have ever, in the whole history of the world, endeavored to effect by artificial alliances, based upon that spurious and therefore constantly fallible fiction, the peculiar sanctity of international contracts. The alliance of our many republics is based on entirely different, and more natural and permanent principles. The twenty-six sovereign States are intimately, and exclusively among themselves, associated by a CONSTITUTION that, in as much as it precludes any subsequent alliance between State and State, or a State and a foreign country, is in its nature superior to old-fashioned treaties, without effecting even an approach to a common nationality. In each State, too, the frequency of elections for the public authorities, which are a sort of peaceful, well regulated, and anticipatory revolutions, effectually defeats the natural tendency to usurpation, either by individual men or by party; while family pride and emulation are safeguards of the whole. By this novel, wise, and permanent alliance, the collective sovereignties of the Union have agreed to act, in all their external relations, in common; while in their domestic affairs they are as independent of the whole as of each other. They exist in association as freemen in society, with the indisputable right to do their individual pleasure, provided they do not trespass on the like freedom of others. Under this form of Union we have long lived, and can live through the indefinite future, happy among ourselves, and secure from open aggression from abroad. On the other hand, the aristocratical doctrine of a general, or even a limited central nationality, is not only false, but manifestly impractic-

cable. The extent of our country over every natural climate; the vast geographical peculiarities of the distinctive States, and the diversity of their relations to external nations, preclude the possibility of one general government legislating for the whole. We have already experienced the inconvenience, trouble, and danger of the exercise of even doubtful powers, by the general congress, which has at times erroneously assumed a national or governmental character. We have fully learned the important fact, that a central national government, properly so called, cannot exist in our country, unless enforced by those coercive means which are in their very nature incompatible with republican institutions.

Without the general prevalence of the political heresy of CONSOLIDATION, among our own people, all the arts and designs of England must fail, and the spirit of Democracy go on over the earth "conquering and to conquer." This doctrine, heretical in America, though perfectly orthodox in Europe, is the nucleus of all opposition to our free institutions, at home or abroad. In every act, maxim, or proposition of the British party in this country, there is to be found the idolatry of consolidation, as the one principle of party existence. The idol is not now, indeed, so plainly exposed as when openly worshipped by the old Federalist sect; but is ever within a thin and flimsy veil, strangely ornamented with changeable appellatives and fustian pretensions. The Bank of the United States was a *national* bank. Beside or beneath all its other purposes, it would serve to embody or amalgamate the States; or rather, by its control of the general money interest of our citizens, it would supersede, or at least prove paramount to our constitutional relations founded on the supposed weaker interest of liberty:—it would effect aristocratical community, by being a great wheel of power, or including case, containing within it all the subordinate parts of our political machinery. In like manner the "protective Tariff" was a *national* act;

coercive in its nature, and springing from usurped, because sovereign, power. It came, too, from that class of artful politicians, who, while they affect to feel for the working classes of the country, are "high-prices" men, in the fullest sense of the term; the champions of property and capital, and the devotees of consolidation. And now, that these have failed them, and disappointed their foreign masters, in the extremity of their haste and distress, they have fairly broached among us the "NATIONAL SIN" of slavery!

The puritanical religionists of the Northern and Eastern States are now piously invoked by holy mother England, to avert the wrath of God from her beloved sister NATION, the United States, by immediately enforcing the abolition of Southern slavery! Like all interlude or specific passions of society, this fanatical zeal must burn, ungovernable, through its necessarily transient career. One may almost read the whole progress of this singular furor, in the nature of man and the structure of society. This much, however, is certainly plain, that burn it does, and burn it will to an extent that will behoove every rational citizen to be incessantly on his guard, that all he prizes in our institutions be not therewith consumed. There has already been a WORLD'S Convention of these maniacs at the foot of England's throne; and could they effect it, they would assemble all created intelligences, on some remote orb of the boundless universe, to point out, as the little earth revolved in the mighty distance, the one dark speck of its concentrated iniquity; and in the obscure intervals, demonstrate to angels and archangels, beyond the possibility of doubt, that the whole purport of the law of Sinai was—slavery at the south! It is vain, however, to treat this new wonder-birth of Abolition with contempt, or to anticipate its immediate decline and fall. It has been already too much disregarded; been kept out of political view, as supposed to be confined to a very limited number of our citizens. This may be true as to those who, as yet, have the dis-



ease in its raging stage ; but whole communities are more or less infected, and the minds of their youth fashioning to receive it. Fostered as it is, by all the clans of consolidationists, and backed by the whole English system, it will but too probably grow to be the most formidable shape the indefatigable enemy of our institutions has ever yet assumed. It will severely try the patriotism of the Union.

The Northern and Eastern States do not contain all the fanatics connected with this singular excitement ; — the consolidationists of the South and West being evidently as wild, in the opposite direction, as any abolitionists in the world. It is surely quite as absurd, and fully as foreign to the nature of our Union, to advocate slavery as a *national* blessing, as to oppose it as a *national* sin. Little indeed would the apparent contraries of these two sects import, if they could but entirely occupy each other's attention. But in fact, they theoretically unite in the *nationality* of the subject, and in the same original and unfounded assumption, that there is an important difference in the hard working of man by man, for a pittance of money, and that of working him for a pittance of food ; and thus they mutually glorify money and consolidation. In like manner, they unite practically, in a common opposition to republican measures and men ; — a proposition or a candidate ever *going too far* for the one, and not far enough for the other ; while they are respectively inflamed by their protracted and futile controversy. It is folly to reason with either faction. An excitement, a communal passion, is in its nature beyond the reach of argument. It can be put down by no earthly means whatever ; but in all cases, great or small, must, like a disease, run a natural course to the peculiar crisis. The abolitionism of our times is not a conclusion of the reason, but a simple feeling. It may, perhaps, be restrained within comparatively narrow bounds, as in a lazaretto, by the calm, firm, and united resistance of the morally healthy, until its dangerous force is exhausted ; but

the power is not now on earth that can speak or drive the evil spirit out of the afflicted.

Fanatics cannot reason. It is, therefore, ever their fate to become the tools of designing and hypocritical politicians. They, who have fomented the terrific disturbance of abolition, know full well that it cannot effect its ostensible object, and care not if it could. The only value they attach to it, is in the hope that it may *nationalize* the whole, or two distinct halves of the Union. It is well understood by these adepts, that the now existing peculiarities of the States, in their climates, character of productions, and domestic institutions, are, whether good or bad in themselves, the stay and support of our State Rights Constitution. If by any means these diversities could be annulled, and all the people of all the States become nearly assimilated in habits and opinions, it is plain that distinct State governments would be worse than useless; would be expensive folly. To any hope of attaining this end, climate is evidently an insuperable impediment; and therefore, a division of the Union, between the northern and southern States, would be accepted by our enemies, as a first step to the full accomplishment of their objects. This division, in as much as it would also separate the slave-holding from the non-slave-holding republics, would leave each portion in so near an approach to the moral assimilation of their respective people, that consolidation, usurpation of governing power, and at last monarchy, would then be a comparatively feasible, and, it may be, spontaneous finale.

Such are the objects, means, and ends of the collective "English policy"; and such the character of the "British party," already formidable in this land of Liberty. He who has a particle of true patriotism in his soul, or who possesses even a feeble share of common philanthropy, must repudiate the whole with scorn and indignation. But, individual protests and abhorrence, without zeal and concert of action, are harmless and

idle things. Few existing governments on earth, could endure for a day or an hour, if a mere miscellaneous and discordant hatred by their people, could overthrow them. Even here at home, a **NEW** unity of patriotic feeling; a complete reorganization of the host of republicans, — having hatred of England, her government, and her system, as its prominent characteristic, — is become eminently essential to the conservation of our institutions. This cannot be materially effected by art, or shaped according to the wishes or ingenuity of any man, or class of men; but chiefly by the supreme law of consecutive social passions, that alternately governs and revolutionizes, despite all diverse national peculiarities, the social and political affairs of mankind. The great passion for wealth, which is now approaching its climax of phrenzy, has completely supplanted that of glory and conquest; and, in its turn, must yield to the new-born ardor for individual liberty which, even now, is every where obtruding upon human governments. Collective society is evidently, at this day, in that irruptive stage which has ever attended the commencement of a new moral era; and forbodes the resistless progress of a mighty spirit, that, however liked or disliked; however beneficent or malignant, preservative or destructive, must and will reign upon the earth until its natural demise; bidding proud defiance, as well to concerted opposition, as to contingent impediments.

This spirit is **DEMOCRACY**. And would that it had pleased the great Power of Control to have severed it widely from the concomitant vengeance, that will, in the earlier part of its career, impress its enemies as the coming of final retribution and wrath. Let it not be disguised from the myriads of minds just now vaguely attuned to the mystery of the present, and the obscurity of the future, that, like each of the great precedent passions, this will be attended by apparent evils, that long ere it passes away, will make it a sorrow to the good and wise. Not that they will or can justly regret its being, or impeach the wisdom of those

who primitively bore it onward in its course, acting in legitimate obedience to the law of Progress, and in ample view of its philosophic meaning, its sequence or fruition. If we recur to historical truth, and recognise, in remote ages, that it was right for the patriarchs to go into Egypt, and also right, after the era revolved, for their descendants to come out from thence, and then follow up the succession of revolutions to the present time, we shall discover, that in the abstract nature of the dynasty of social passions, the termination of the old is ever attended by oppression, and the beginning of the new by great hope. It may indeed, be recorded as a prominent clause in the law of Progress, that the commencement of every new moral era justly claims the support of the Liberalists of the time. It is never so much a question with these, what the actually ruling principle is in itself; whether it be perfect or imperfect; purely just, or intermixed with evil; as whether it be in strict accordance with the march of time, and that promise of eventual happiness which is in all collective being; or merely isolated and unmeaning, as many minor excitements have been. Detached, sectional, and transient irruptions of social feeling, however violently they may rage, add nothing to the furtherance of, but rather suspend the grand tendencies of creation. They may always be known by their sudden birth and inflation; by their ready accordance with ancient institutions and prejudices, and by palpable *unfitness*, through a want of correspondence with the general "signs of the times." They are of those false things, of which many have already been with the proclamation "Lo here!" for which the staid and careful mind has ever been prepared. They have nothing to do with the reality of progress; and though for a while they deceive many, soon pass away, leaving as it were mere accidental and unintelligible blots upon the page of history.

The spirit of Democracy is of a different, and far more serious type. Like all those which have hereto-

fore actually revolutionized society, and marked it with a durable change of character, this spirit advances upon the earth, with the resolved, graduated, and steady step incidental to inherent right, and inevitable success. Its claim to universal sovereignty, is every where acknowledged by the impatient and premature hostility of the worshippers of the past and present. A deep and ominous dread; "a fearful looking for" of ruinous events, is impressed upon the minions of the money power, and betrays their conscious or instinctive knowledge of the new paramount principle of the future. They know that its elements; — the ardent love of individual liberty, and the organization of society wholly upon strictly just and entirely *general* regulations, — are at total variance with those old and ingenious hypotheses upon which their favorite system is founded, — necessary evils, aggregate happiness out of common misery, and far distant future blessing for present endurance. It is, therefore, justly deemed **RADICAL** in its character; and, by this quality, to transcend all preceding revolutions. By the common consent, by the united convictions of the world, Democracy is the most profound and comprehensive spirit that has ever claimed or obtained the control of society. All former revolutions, however consequential, chiefly involved the lords and leaders of men, or aimed only at the seat of power; while that which impends, includes all collective mankind, and, in its career, will prove to be no mean exemplification not only of the shaking of the earth, but of the heavens also.

Like the rush of mighty waters overflowing, it is then conceded, that the vast oppressed majority of mankind, will sooner or later, break from the conventional restraints of subtle theories and prejudices, and pour forth successfully, upon the collective powers of Misrule. That they will not always heed unnecessary devastation, or confine themselves to judiciously devised courses of action, is incidental to the very nature of a revolution that is resisted. And resisted democracy will



be, to the last gleam of hope, by all those who are, or strongly desire to be in the ascendancy of wealth. As certain as the Church resisted the infancy of the Reformation by all manner of means, and the great Hero of warlike glory violently opposed the young English system, under the more mature force of which he fell, so will the vast and fully developed Money Power, oppose, with unprecedented vigor and subtile ingenuity, the growth of the Democratic spirit. The passion for wealth and the ardent love of Liberty, are antagonist powers worthy of each other. The one eminently brave, confident, and heedless of secondary obstacles; the other cowardly, cunning, and minutely systematic; it is evident there can never be compromise between them. They are thoroughly incompatible, and at the utmost extremes of variance. In no modern convulsion of society, have the appropriate differences of individual opinion extensively broken the minor conventional relations of social life. In the contest between the Catholic and Feudal principles; the Military and Ecclesiastical; the Commercial and Military, families and even whole nations very generally took part in mass, while individual peace was seldom disturbed. The forthcoming era, however, will manifest characteristics as profound and enlarged as are its contending passions. The conflict between individual interest and individual feeling, will probe society to its elementary foundations, and make trifles even of the closest ties of consanguinity. The world has, in all time, occasionally experienced brief periods of individual persecution and antipathy, which seemed to be prophetic indications of subsequent social dissolution; and here at home, within a few years past, there have been promiscuous threatenings, in high political struggles, to sever the ordinary business relations of society, and suspend its courtesies, in paramount obedience to a vague party spirit. But when the great antagonist hosts shall come to their new, true, and severally consolidated character, these yet flickering indications will become identified with the genius of the times. All species of associa-

tion of man with fellow man, of opposite moral characters, will cease, through the ripened hatred of the one, and the pusillanimity of the other. As firm resolution easily passes into obstinacy, suffering, wretchedness, and starvation may become matters of pride — as sometimes in the monastic age — and constant discord, public and domestic, give rise to continual broils, painful, destructive, bloody.

The programme of the story is told; let the details be wisely left to time, or fancy accommodate them to the hopes or the fears of politicians. To one class of men, the worst that can be apprehended has no terrors; to the other class, the best that can be hoped for is appalling. If there yet be those who are indifferent or neutral, they will soon tremblingly fall in with the one, or manfully join the other. The worst features the revolution can possibly assume will be amply justified, and, indeed, accurately measured, by the immense mass of social evil to be overthrown; a mass that, as the spirit advances, will gradually develop its enormity, now dimmed by habit and prejudice. The final result is inevitable. Then why should we endeavor to put off that "evil day," which all ages and events have prophesied, or in any way resist the final cause of creation itself, in the successive and distinct demonstrations of general society? Evils, serious and dreadful, have attended the origin and course of every former social revolution. Nothing that can occur in the impending career of the democratic spirit, but will have had its antetype, or corresponding feature, in one or more of those which have preceded it. Even *demagoguism* — undue individual ascendancy — to which the democratic era seems particularly liable, has its parallel in the money system, and had in all that have gone before it. Who is this, or that man, that he should be the wealthiest, or the bravest, or the holiest of all around him? Surely nothing but the indefatigable use of the tolerated means of the time — no matter whether honest or dishonest — has ever effected personal ascen-

dency ; which, heretofore, has been quite as spurious as it will or can be in the early and imperfect part of the reign of Democracy. Instead of being of a specially exceptionable type, the coming variety of individual superiority will approximate gradually to the natural or heavenly gifts of men, until, in the end, stratagem and contingency may altogether vanish, and society come to be organized wholly upon the immutable and eternal laws of universal mind.

The prominent men of any one system of social organization have ever characteristically differed from the prominent men of the others ; and each successive class has been utterly destitute of substantial claims. The feudal lords ; the monks and prelates ; the military generals, possessed an altogether adventitious supremacy over their contemporaries ; and it is certainly quite as well that popular declaimers, or men of mere political tact, or, in extremity, even the pride of poverty, should sway, for a time, the minor evolutions of society, as that our merchants should be "the great men of the earth." On broad, philosophical principles, there is no ground for choice among the whole ; but in view of the law of Progress, each successive species of ascendancy is better than the former. The guide of thought and reason is rightfully in the convergence of events to the future, and not in their divergence from the past. The great inquiry of the human mind is, and ever has been, what does creation mean ? or, to what result — magnificent and wonderful, beyond doubt — are all things tending ? The feelings of prophetic hope and prophetic fear, that have ever divided mankind under all systems of society, irresistibly testify, not only to the instability of the time being, but to a certain grand climacteric era, in the future, which shall simplify and explain the whole mystery of the past ; shall satisfactorily solve the complex problem of evil, and usher in Reality through the ruins of Fiction. If then, there were yet to come a thousand of those moral kings, or reigning passions, like unto the few

which have been already, and are passing or passed away, the children of Hope would justly All-hail the coming one. But, there will be no more. It is a general feeling in all classes of men, that Democracy will not only fell and root up all the stately products of artificial cultivation, but plough deep the surface of the whole earth, to the final annihilation of even the germs of fiction. After having quelled resistance, and thereby, having its vindictiveness satiated, it will rapidly mellow down ; and finally, leave society with a surface placid and unsophisticated, in comparison with any former period, and for the first time, since the primitive fall, fitted for the extraordinary novelty of "Peace on earth, good will towards men," and the eternal reign of the KING OF KINGS.

V.

ART. III. — *The Policy to be pursued hereafter by the Friends of the Constitution, and of Equal Rights.*

CONTRARY to our wishes, but hardly contrary to our fears, we have now to record the signal success of the friends and supporters of William Henry Harrison. The whigs are now in the ascendancy in the Union, and in a majority of the States. With the fourth of March next, commences a whig dynasty, to last at least four years. The people have so willed, and, whatever may be our individual convictions, hopes, or fears, we must submit.

Whether this result will be for the good of the country, or the evil, it is impossible as yet to decide. We have not desired it. We have had no fellowship with the whig party, no sympathy with their methods of electioneering, and no confidence in their acknowledged principles. We have deprecated their success as a serious calamity, similar in its nature to the subjugation of a free and independent people by a foreign power, and likely to be not less disastrous in its conse-

quences. We have honestly believed that the safety of our free institutions, the progress of liberty and social Equality, demanded the reelection of Mr. Van Buren, and the success of his friends in the Union and the States. But a majority of the people, wisely or unwisely, have decided differently, and though we cannot, as yet, honor their decision, we must respect it as the law of the land till it be reversed.

But however much we may fear of the worst, we owe it to ourselves to say, that we by no means despair of the Republic. We are not among those, who have unbounded confidence in the actual virtue and intelligence of the people; and the recent elections have by no means tended to increase what little confidence we may have had; but we have great faith in the capacities of human nature, and we believe there is already enough of virtue and intelligence in our community, to arrest any dangerous tendency in the government, before it shall be too late. Moreover, we believe firmly in an overruling Providence; and the Providence, which has selected this as the chosen land of freedom, thus far watched over and protected us, and prepared us for the work assigned us in the progress of civilization, we cannot believe will abandon us before we have accomplished our mission. We confide with calmness in the God of our fathers, and trust that he will yet deliver us from the Philistines, and enable us to build the Temple of Freedom, which shall abide the ravages of time, and within which shall one day meet in peace, to pay their vows, the whole family of disenthralled and regenerated man.

Moreover, in analyzing with some care the elections which have resulted in favor of General Harrison, we still find ground for hope. The people in these elections have not, in their own estimation, decided against freedom and equality; nay, they have not decided against the doctrines or measures of the democratic party. They have not deserted, and we have as yet no reason to believe that they will desert, their ancient democratic faith. However it may have been



with the whig leaders and wire pullers, the great mass of the people whom they have carried away, have not voted against the administration because they have condemned its measures. They have asked not for a change of measures, but of men. They have looked upon the present administration, in its administrative character, as low-minded and corrupt, as deficient in both capacity and integrity, and therefore as unfit to be entrusted with the management of public affairs. Here is the secret of the recent revolution, — a revolution which in the minds of the majority of the people extends only to men. The people we need not say have been deceived, wofully deceived; but the moment they become aware of the fact, they will lose no time in rectifying their mistake. If the men, they have now placed in power, undertake to carry out a policy essentially different from that which has been pursued for the last twelve years, they will hurl them from power at the earliest moment permitted by the forms of the Constitution.

With this conviction, we cannot despair. We believe the present administration has been most grossly belied; but, in its purely administrative character, we have no disposition to take up its defence. In this character, it has no extraordinary claims on the affection of the people. It is remarkable neither for its sagacity nor its purity. There are, we should hope, many other men in the country who can administer the government as well as they have done. Still in justice to Mr. Van Buren, we must say, that in the measures requiring legislative action, which he has recommended or sustained, he has done well, been faithful to the Constitution, and deserves, as he will one day receive, the gratitude of his country.

Mr. Van Buren has been defeated; but he is much dearer to the American people to-day than he was when elected President. He has failed in his reelection, not because he has lost in popularity, but because he never was the choice of the American people. The people never willed his elevation to the presidential chair. He

was elevated to that chair, not by his own popularity, but by the popularity of his predecessor, and by the management of party leaders. Since he became President, he has for the first time in his life gained a place in the affections of the American people, and he retires from the presidency, with an enviable popularity, and an honest fame which will endure.

We are, however, far from regarding Mr. Van Buren as entirely free from faults, and faults which in these times cannot be without results. He strikes us as deficient in boldness and enthusiasm. He has great coolness, is firm, and will die in the last ditch sooner than abandon his avowed principles; but his better qualities rarely manifest themselves till he is put upon his defence; and, though they may spread a glory around his grave and secure him a hero's fame, they generally come too late to retrieve the losses of his friends, or to change the fortunes of the day. His policy is to wait, to trust to time, to "the sober second thought of the people"; in other words to follow public opinion and events, not to lead them. His is not the bold master mind that seizes time by the forelock, that creates his own public, and bends it to his will. He may ride upon the storm, but he does not direct its course. Yet there is something almost sublime in the calmness, the composure with which he suffers himself to be carried along, whither he apparently sees not. He is not deficient in mere intellect, and his political information is respectable. In ordinary times, when passion is asleep, and reason awake, he were not ill qualified to be the president of a free people. But in these revolutionary times, his qualities are not of the sort most in demand. He wants elevation, nobility of ideas, and warmth of heart. Sober reasoning, calm reflection, mere good sense are not now the sovereigns of the world. Men's passions are aroused, their feelings are excited, and they are moved by appeals to their sympathies rather than to their understandings. They see not clearly, but they feel intensely; and they ask for a man to go before them who fears not the darkness, whose step falters

not, and who can lend them a confidence not their own. Such a man Mr. Van Buren has not proved himself. One such man we had in Thomas Jefferson ; another we had in Andrew Jackson ; another — we shall find him in due time.

That the administration party has been defeated through its own faults, rather than through the frauds, falsehoods, and misrepresentations of the opposing party, of which there have been enough, and more than enough, for even Beelzebub's infinite satisfaction, we suppose it would not be difficult to show. But, what were the use in attempting to do it? It is a miserable disposition, that which delights to dwell on the blunders of friends, or which can bring itself to upbraid associates with the reverses which all must share in common. Defeat like the grave levels all distinctions, and hides all faults. If things had been different, they would have been different. This is the amount of all fault-finding with the past. But things were as they were, and the result is what it is, and there is the end of the matter, and no more need be said about it. It is not the temper of Democracy to weep over past errors, or to turn round and scold her friends when she chances to meet a repulse. Her face is ever towards the future, which alone is hers ; and she labors to recruit her forces, and to stand ready for whatever may come. She knows that though she may be checked in her onward march for a moment, she cannot be driven back ; and that though she may sometimes fail to win, she never loses. If her leaders managed badly yesterday and failed, she trusts that they will acquire wisdom from their mismanagement, and become able to conquer to-morrow.

We regret, deeply regret, the ill success of the democratic party ; but we have no reproaches to cast on friend or foe. We are as ready to engage again with those with whom we fought side by side yesterday, as we should have been, had we entirely approved, as we did not, their arrangements. In this we are not alone. We express the feelings of the great body of those, who,

as friends of the Constitution and of Equal Rights, have struggled, with what skill and bravery were in them, to sustain the administration. We have been unsuccessful, but we have not lost our temper, nor are we disposed to run foul of one another. We have by a common fate become but the more endeared to each other. Personal animosities have subsided. The Democracy will hereafter be disturbed by no intestine divisions, by no personal rivalries; but will present to the enemies of liberty and social progress, an unbroken front, a closely knit body, animated by one and the same soul, and directed by one and the same will. They are now indeed a band of brothers, sworn to stand by one another; and they will stand by one another in adversity, as they did not always in prosperity; and so long as one of them can stand, liberty shall not want a defender, nor social equality an advocate.

For the present the Democracy will wait the movements of the new dynasty. They will assume not the attitude of opposition, but of watchfulness. If the whig policy shall prove to be democratic, they will not oppose it, but give it their cordial support. But if it be at war with that which has been pursued by the administration for the last twelve years, as there is but too much ground to fear that it will, then it must count on an opposition, not factious, but calm, determined, uncompromising, whether successful or unsuccessful. The whig party has come into power by pretending to be democratic; it has come in, to a considerable extent, unpledged, and is therefore free to adopt the democratic policy if it chooses; we must then wait its movements, and hold ourselves free to sustain or oppose as it shall prove itself democratic or not.

During this period of waiting, we must not, however, be idle. We must avail ourselves of the comparative repose, with which we are favored, to fix the basis of our creed, to consolidate our policy, and to prepare ourselves to take the field again, if we must take it again, with a perfect understanding of the objects for which

we are to contend, and with as entire agreement as may be, concerning the methods by which we must proceed, and by which we may hope to win.

Two parties there are in this country, and two parties there always will be ; — a party in favor of Property, whose leading object will be to facilitate the profitable investment of business capital, to make the government a mere instrument for facilitating trade ; and a party in favor of Man, whose leading object will be to secure to the workingman a greater share of the proceeds of his labor, and to elevate labor and make it honorable. These two parties have existed from the formation of the Federal Government, and they will not cease to exist under the new dynasty. Whether the whigs in their actual policy will ultimately prove themselves the first named party or the second, we shall not now attempt to determine. For our part, we shall always be found with the second, the party of the Constitution, of Equal Rights, of the workingman, whatever may be the name by which it may be called, and whether it be in power or out of power.

This second named party is properly the party of the Constitution, and of Equal Rights. It in reality comprises a large majority of the American population, and when it can be rallied, as it has not been effectually in the late contest, it is able to carry everything before it. The great aim of the friends of liberty, of social progress, and the practical realization of the principles incorporated into our free institutions, should be to rally this party, to unite in one body all who sympathize with it. This party has heretofore failed, because vast numbers of those, who properly belong to it, have not come to its aid. False issues have been made, and elections have not turned on the real matters in dispute. Hence this party, the true democratic party of the country, has been divided, and friend has, unhappily, fought against friend, and natural and irreconcilable enemies have fought in the same ranks side by side. This has created no little confusion, and caused all the disasters the Democracy has experienced. We must study to



remedy this evil, to make up the *true* issue, and collect all the democrats of the country under the same banner, and keep them on one and the same side.

This can be done only by falling back on first principles. The Democracy is never moved by mere words, by mere shadows. It is grave, solemn, earnest. It demands realities. It asks for the substance. It supports no party because it bears this or that name, no individuals because they are *called* democrats. A party to gain its suffrages must *be* democratic; and men must *be* democrats, or it will not confide in them, or follow their guidance. It asks only what is just, and that it does ask. It asks for an open, straight-forward, honest policy. It has a great dislike to all manœuvering, to all crooked paths, to all underhanded methods of proceeding. It would take its ground openly and manfully, in the broad light of day, and maintain it by fair means, or not at all. It has also a great horror of half-way measures, measures, which excite all the opposition of whole measures, and yet effect nothing when carried. The timid, trimming, compromising policy, so much insisted upon by fourth-rate politicians, finds no support in the instincts or the reason of the people. Democracy abhors it, and it can find supporters only among mere party leaders themselves. Democracy demands a bold policy; measures which amount to something; which reach far and wide; and which will accomplish something worth making an effort for. Who will go to war, risk ease, wealth, life itself, when even victory secures no advantage? The leaders of the democratic party have erred on this point. They have talked finely, but they have done little else than talk. They have eulogized Liberty, declaimed about Equality, and spoken of the dignity of labor, but unhappily, they have kept too far in the abstract. They have proposed little that is tangible, palpable; and the people have felt that, if all which they propose were adopted, it would effect but a slight, a scarcely perceptible mitigation of the evils of our existing social state.

Some may say that our friends have failed to succeed even in the small measures they have proposed, and ask, how then could they have succeeded in greater measures? It is simply because their measures have been small, and capable of realizing only a trifling good, that they have failed. They have failed not because they have attempted too much, but because they have attempted too little. They have proposed nothing big enough to fill the heart of the people, to enlist its affections, kindle its enthusiasm, and call forth its energy. The giant will not rouse himself to crush a fly. If you really mean to be true to the great principles of freedom and equality, if you really mean to ameliorate society, elevate the laborer, and make every man really a man, free and independent; then you must say so, and show by the measures you propose that you mean so. Show that you are in earnest, that you are contending for something, and that you have the nerve to contend for it effectually, and then you will inspire confidence, touch the nobility of human nature, the magnanimity of the people, and carry the masses in one solid phalanx with you. You must have the souls of heroes, if you wish to take the place of heroes, or reap their success. Nay, if you ask for heroic deeds from the people, you must give them a cause able to kindle the heroic spirit. If you have no inborn heroism, if you have no power to grasp the great, the noble; no courage to propose the bold and the daring; then stand aside, with your timid, half-way measures, bowing, and cringing, and praying to be admitted; stand aside and let men, who have the souls of men, the minds and the hearts of men, who fear nothing, who tremble, blench at nothing, save the mean, the wrong, the inefficient, let them take your places, and try their hand at conducting the Democracy to victory.

The truth is, too many, who call themselves democrats, are democrats only in the abstract, only in pretty phrases, or high-sounding words, and flattering epithets. Propose any thing really democratic, anything that is likely to result in making democracy something

more than a splendid dream, and forthwith these sonorous democrats are frightened, they look pale, and begin to tremble for their own cushioned seats. Poor fellows ! They are afraid they shall be *disgigged*, and thus lose their respectability. Such are not the men to lead on the Democracy. Whoso loves father or mother, sister or brother, wife or children, nay, or his own life, more than Democracy, is not worthy in these times to be her champion. Her cause can be promoted only by men who dare to live for her, or if need be to die for her ; who can joy even in exile, in the dungeon, or on the cross, at the prospect of her success.

Men love the brave spirit, the heroic soul, and they fall down and worship him who risks all that is dear to him in their cause. Why are men so attracted by military glory ? why has military prowess such power over the masses ? Because, men delight in war and bloodshed, in hewing and mangling the bodies of their brethren, in carrying widowhood to the wife, and childlessness to the mother ? Nonsense. Men are not cruel. They delight not in scenes of carnage ; they hear no music in the groans of the wounded and dying, the bereaved and the disconsolate. It is because they see courage, nobility, disinterestedness, a power in the warrior that raises him above himself, above all fear of danger, or death. It is because war reveals the brave, the heroic spirit. Here too is the reason why the people always prefer the military chieftain to the mere politician. They distrust the politician, because they believe him cool, calculating, crafty, selfish, cowardly, destitute of bravery and enthusiasm, as most politicians have been and are. The people care little for mere intellect. They have no faith in dry calculations, in the cool deductions of logic. Intellect to them is a god, only when it is accompanied by high moral qualities, nobleness of soul, generous emotion, warmth of affection, and a contempt of difficulties and dangers.

But, interposes one of our *prudent* politicians, You are all wrong. You ruin everything by going too fast. You must not outrun public sentiment. Away

with your public sentiment ! Seize the right, the true, the beautiful, the good, hold them up in their native simplicity and loveliness, and know that public sentiment is sure to be with you. The "common people" will listen to you with open ears, eyes, and mouth. They will arm in your defence, declare you their king, and take the kingdom for you by storm. It is your want of confidence in the greatness and generosity of human nature, that ruins you ; it is your fear that, if you trust the people with the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, they, like a herd of swine, will turn and rend you, that makes you powerless, mean and insignificant. Out upon you ! If you are democrats, dare trust the people, dare trust them with the truth, dare trust them with all that you believe necessary to their salvation. Ask not what they believe, what they will support. Be generous, be brave, be heroic, speak the truth and support the right, at the sacrifice of your lives if need be, and know that they then believe what you believe, and support what you support.

But, is there no danger of being rash, of attempting more than the people will bear ? Miserable cowards, who boast that "discretion is the better part of valor,"

"That he who fights and runs away,  
May live to fight another day ;"

we advise *you* to attempt nothing at all. If you have not confidence enough in the people to trust them with much, be assured that they will not trust you with little. True prudence is what you would call rashness. True prudence is never made up of timidity and selfishness, but of lofty daring, and generous confidence.

This feeling that politicians have about the imprudence of attempting much, and the prudence of attempting little, arises from a mistaken notion of the true office of government. In nearly all ages and countries of the world, the office of government has been to impose burdens on the people, to force from the people a larger portion of their earnings, or to keep

them quiet under an order of things from which the few alone profit. Hence the necessity of craft, of subtlety, secrecy, dissimulation on the part of the politician. It becomes necessary for him to proceed with great caution, to seem to be what he is not, to pretend one thing and to do another. Now if this be the office of government, the politicians are right. If it be their object, by the aid of government to ride the people, it is prudent for them to beware and not attempt too much at once. If the object be to impose burdens on the people, then your half-way measures, we admit, are the safest, and the only safe measures. You must not lay on too heavy a load at once, lest the animal rear up and hit you a kick, or lest you break the poor fellow's back. But the real office of government is not to increase, but to lighten the load borne by the people. Your object should be to throw off the poor creature's burden, and to let him go free, and graze at will on the mountain or in the valley. If this *be* your object, as it should be, you must show the people that what you propose to throw off will really lighten their load, if you wish them to coöperate with you, or even to stand still while you proceed in your efforts. The people do not like to be mocked. They will not thank you for removing an ounce from their burdens, while you leave them bowed down under the weight of tons. In politics, as in all things else, the old maxim holds good, "nothing venture, nothing have."

In order then to rally the Democracy, and unite them all in a firm resolution to recover their rights, and to take the direction of the social and political affairs of the country, we must adopt a bold policy, and propose bold measures. We must show that the measures we propose will do something more than merely assuage the pain of the social wound, without healing it. Palliatives will no longer answer our purpose. Mere expedients will be worse than useless. We must go to the bottom, and lay our foundation deep. We must build on ultimate, universal, and immutable Right, and propose measures which will either destroy the social



fabric entirely, or reconstruct it as it should be. We must be thorough ; propose not what we think we can carry, but what we think we ought to carry ; not what we in our wisdom may deem practicable, but what in the exercise of our better nature we deem just and desirable. We must not say, "such and such a thing is right, is desirable, but the people will not assent to it." Party leaders may not assent to it, but the people will. Why should what appears to your better nature as right and desirable, not appear the same to them ? Have you a different nature from theirs ? Propose then, a bold and efficient policy ; one which, if carried out, will realize the ideal which the wise and good are struggling after.

It is not our province, nor is it any man's province, to say authoritatively what this policy must be ; but it is our right and our duty, as it is the right and the duty of every man, to give our views of what it ought to be, and to use all the moral means in our power to determine what it shall be. We propose therefore in what follows to give to some extent our views in relation to the course which should be pursued, and the measures which should be adopted, by the Friends of the Constitution, and of Equal Rights. We shall speak of course for ourselves, but we shall also speak what we have good reasons to believe will be acceptable to the great body of the Democracy. Our motive for speaking at this time is to contribute what we can to bring about a perfect agreement among all the believers in social progress, and to give to the social and political movement of our countrymen a salutary direction.

The first thing necessary to be determined is the end we are to seek. What is the end, which in our political movements we should have in view ? Should we aim merely to keep things as they are ? Should we be satisfied to go on as we have done for the last fifty years ? Is it enough merely to maintain the forms of a free government, and to keep its administration in the hands of the democratic party ? Ought we not rather to aim at some advance ? Should we not regard

our free government in the light of a means to an end? Should we not feel that it is our duty to use our democratic forms of government as instruments in our hands for working out a moral and a social good? Governments, unless we have greatly erred, are worth nothing in themselves, are never to be supported for their own sake, as ends. They are valuable, they command our support, only as means, only for the use we can make of them. Can we make no better use of government than we have heretofore done? Can we not direct it to a higher end? Indeed is there not an end which we should always seek, towards which we should direct all governmental measures and action? What is this end?

We have answered this question more than once. We contend that the Mission of this country is to emancipate the proletariat, to ennoble labor, raise up the laboring classes, and make every man really free and independent. Under the material relation, we ask that every man become an independent proprietor, possessing enough of the goods of this world, to be able by his own moderate industry to provide for the wants of his body; and under the spiritual relation, that he be free to develop harmoniously all his faculties, and have access to the highest culture the community can furnish. We demand for every man wealth to start with in life sufficient, if he make a proper use of it, for him to hold, so far as wealth gives distinction, an equal rank with any other man in the community. In a word we demand a state of society in which every man's rank shall be measured by his capacities, intelligence, and virtues, and where the intelligence and virtues shall be as nearly equal as the diversities of men's natural aptitudes will admit. There must not be a learned class and an unlearned, a cultivated class and an uncultivated, a refined class and a vulgar, a wealthy class and a poor. There shall not be one class owning all the funds, and another performing all the labor of production. There shall be no division of society into workingmen and idlers, employers and operatives.

There shall be workingmen, but no proletaries; for we would have all men work each on his own capital, associated or not associated, on equal terms with his brother. This is the end we aim at; this is the Mission of this country, and to this should all the measures of government directly or indirectly tend.

Now we are far from supposing that this end can or will be realized in a day. We see as clearly as any of our friends, that its realization is far distant in the future. Not indeed because the great mass of the people are not prepared for it; but because the leaders of parties are in no haste to reach it, and for the most part want courage to attempt it. But let this be as it may; the end we have designated we should keep ever in view, and the wisdom or unwisdom of every political or legislative measure should be tested by its tendency to carry us towards it, or to remove us from it. Government is of no value to us, except so far as we can use it for the realization of this end.

We say here, in order to prevent misconception, that we are far from regarding government as the only means in our power for realizing the end we have proposed. Our faith in government is not unbounded. Government has no wisdom beyond the wisdom of society, and it can in this country be nothing more than the agent of society for embodying, for executing its will. It is not government that gives the law to society; but society that gives the law to government. Unquestionably our chief concern is with society, and our main endeavor should be to create a true public opinion, and that exaltation of the public sentiment which will carry society with resistless force towards the completion of its destiny. This is to be done by moral, religious, and intellectual influences. These influences are then of course more essential than governmental action. These determine the action of society, and the end towards which it shall act.

But still we are far from regarding government, as some one asserts, as "at best a necessary evil." We look upon man as both an individual and as a member

of society ; and his perfection requires both individual action and social. There are some things which he can do and must do alone by himself ; there are others equally necessary to be done, which can be done and must be done by society only. Man must act collectively as well as individually. Now his collective action is the action of society, that is government. If, then, we mean society shall do anything, if we recognise in any shape the necessity of associated action, we must have government. We accept it then not only as necessary but as a great good. We would indeed leave a large space to the individual, but we would not leave him entirely alone. The *laissez-faire* doctrine, so much in vogue with a certain class of politicians, does not meet our approbation. Men require to be governed, and coercion of some sort is indispensable. They need to be combined into a whole, and directed towards a common end, which shall be for the common good of all, and the special good of each. Hence it is that we recognise, not absolute power, but a certain power in society to control the action of her members, and to force them into a qualified submission to her will. This power is founded in right, and constitutes the legitimate basis of government. We owe to society a certain obedience, and should be loyal to her whenever she steps not beyond her province.

We hold that society has the right to adopt such measures as are likely to be for the common good of all her members, and the special good of each, even against the will of individuals ; nay, more, she is bound to adopt such measures at the earliest practicable moment, let the active opposition to her proceedings be what it may. If this were not so, no social progress could be made ; the best and most salutary reforms could be defeated by the obstinacy, the pride, the ignorance, the prejudice, or the interested views of some half-a-dozen individuals. The whole race might be compelled to linger on in intolerable wretchedness, because a few anti-social spirits should fancy their interest was promoted by it. This will not do. Throw in-

deed a bulwark of sanctity around the individual, determine what are the rights of the individual, suffer society never to encroach upon them ; but while you take care not to sacrifice one to all, take care also not to sacrifice all to one. The rights of the individual are sacred, and so are the rights of society.

Government we regard as the agent of society, the instrument by means of which society works. Our duty as individuals is to use our best influences to induce society to use this instrument wisely, effectively, and for the accomplishment of the right end. The mission of government, taken as the executive agency of society, is not merely negative. It is more than to prevent one man or one nation from encroaching on the rights of another. Its duty is positive still more than it is negative. Its business is to protect, to guide, to control, and by combining the many into one body to effect a good, which must forever transcend the reach of mere individual effort.

It is often said that men are born equal, that all men are equal by nature. This, if it have reference to their rights, or if it mean that so far forth as they are men, partakers of a common nature, they are equal, we admit it ; but in almost every other possible sense we deny it. Men, regarded as individuals, are by nature unequal. Some are healthy and others are sickly, some are strong and others are weak, some are cunning and others are simple, some have bold, comprehensive minds, others timid, feeble intellects, hardly capable of putting two ideas together. Now leave all these individuals free to act according to their natural capacities, and what must be the result ? A state of gross inequality. All the advantages of society will be monopolized by the strong and the cunning, who will not fail to throw all its burdens upon the weak and less gifted. But even admitting that government should prevent all encroachment upon the rights of these last, we should not be satisfied. The strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak. Government should step in and maintain between all the members of society that Equality, so



far as it may be done, which does not exist among men by nature. Government is mainly necessary in consequence of men's natural inequality, the perpetual tendency of which is to lead to gross social inequality, and its mission is to introduce and maintain an equality which does not exist by nature. Its mission is two-fold. On the one hand, its duty is to *protect* the rights of individuals, and on the other, to *force* individuals to perform their duties towards one another. Government is unquestionably restricted to a limited sphere of action; but within that sphere we hold that it is imperative, and may, nay is bound to enforce its commands.

We have dwelt the longer on this point, because just at present the legitimacy of all governments is questioned by a respectable class of Reformers, who condemn all political action, and look upon him who hopes to accomplish any good by the agency of government, as either a very weak or a very base-minded man; and because too many of our leading democrats are in the habit of counting on only the negative agency of government. Give us, say these last, an open field and fair play, and individual skill and enterprise will do the rest. We think not. Society as well as the individual in the progress of civilization has a great work to perform, a positive as well as a negative work; and we shall find that society must often needs perform her work, as the indispensable condition of the individual's performing his.

Assuming then that society through government has a work to perform, a mission to fulfil, an end to seek, and that this end is what we have stated it to be; we must bear in mind that this work, in this country, is to be performed by the State Governments, and not by the Federal Government. The Federal Government is neither a democratic nor an anti-democratic government, and was instituted for the purpose of carrying out neither the democratic nor the aristocratic principle. The constituents of that government are communities, not individuals, and it has no concern with the relations of individuals with one another. Its business

is solely with free and independent, but associated communities, and its duties remain precisely the same, whether these communities be internally constituted according to the democratic principle, or the aristocratic. There are certain matters which concern all the States alike, such as their relations with foreigners, with the Indian tribes, and with one another, the general welfare and common defence of the whole. These matters and these only come within the province of the Federal Government.

The first business of the American statesman is always to distinguish accurately between what he may attempt by the Federal Government, and what must be looked for from the State Governments alone. Much mischief has already arisen from not having distinguished with sufficient care between the respective provinces of the two governments. Democracy and aristocracy have both attempted to carry out their respective principles by means of the Federal Government; and hence it is we talk of democracy and aristocracy in relation to that government, when these terms, properly speaking, have no connexion with it, and can apply only to the State Governments.

It is unquestionably for the interests of democracy that the Federal Government should be kept within its province; so far democracy may apply to a party in connexion with it. It is also for the interest of the anti-democratic States, in which slavery is tolerated, to keep faithful to the Constitution, for slavery rests on State Legislation, and might be endangered if State Rights were abandoned. These States have the same interest in regard to the Federal government, that the Democracy have, and will in general be found acting with them. They constitute the same party in relation to the General Government; but not in relation to that government by any means a democratic party. It is a party made up of democrats and anti-democrats. It is properly a constitutional party, a State Rights party, and so should it be called.

As a party of the Union, we democrats of the North

must support the Federal Constitution. We must raise the State Rights Flag, or we shall not be able to maintain an open field, for the carrying out of our democratic principles, which are to be carried out solely by the agency of the State governments. In regard to the Union, then, our policy is simple. It is to maintain the Constitution, and resist all efforts of the Federal government to enlarge, directly or indirectly, its powers at the expense of the States. As a party of the Union we must not call ourselves democrats or aristocrats, but strict constructionists, constitutionalists. In acting under this relation we may have often to act with those who do not sympathize with our democratic hopes and tendencies. No matter. Are they Constitutionalists? Are they opposed to enlarging the powers of the Federal government? Do they go for the Independence of the States? Then we and they are, as a party of the Union, of the same party, although in the States themselves we may be of opposite parties. It is not necessary that a man should be a democrat, or have any democratic sympathies, in order to be a constitutionalist.

The truth is, it is not the Aristocracy of the country that has given to the Federal government its dangerous direction, but the Democracy, through the mistaken notion, that it was by that government it was to realize its hopes. The South which, though liberal and chivalrous, is by no means democratic, has been the main supporter of the Constitution. The Old Federal party of New England, during the administration of Jefferson and that of Madison, labored indefatigably to check the Federal government, and to restrict it to as narrow a sphere as possible. Massachusetts during the War carried her State Rights Doctrines to the utmost verge of treason to the Union, and the Hartford Convention solemnly proclaimed very nearly the doctrine subsequently contended for by South Carolina. If we are not much mistaken, the policy, which has so enlarged the sphere of the Federal government, was forced upon it by the leading democratic States. The

worst feature of this policy is the Tariff. But the tariff has been uniformly opposed by the Southern States, and a majority of the delegation in Congress from the New-England States. No tariff has ever received a majority of the votes of New-England, and none, not even the new tariff act, commonly called the compromise act, of 1832, has ever received a majority of the votes of the Southern delegation. The tariff policy has been from the first sustained by the Middle and Western States, which have always gone for it by large majorities. The Middle and Western States we may certainly call the democratic States of the Union. The Southern States are not democratic, for they tolerate slavery, and New-England we believe has been the principal defender of the anti-democratic doctrines of the old Federal party.

The Federalists, no doubt, wished for a consolidated republic, some few of them perhaps for a consolidated monarchy. But the South, in consequence of her peculiar domestic institutions, contended for State Rights; for she saw at once, that if all the States should be subjected to the supremacy of a central government, that her peculiar institutions would be obliged to give way before the strong anti-slavery feeling of the Middle and Eastern States. The small States too, which by no means wished to be swallowed up in the large ones, being equally represented with the large States in the Convention, were able to resist effectually the centralizationists, and to preserve to the States their sovereignty. The Federalists were defeated. They attempted under Washington, and especially under the elder Adams, to obtain by construction and administrative measures what had been denied them in the Convention. But after the election of Mr. Jefferson, and especially his reelection, the policy of the New-England Federalists, to say the least, was almost wholly changed. They turned themselves to the State governments, and sought to lessen the importance of the Federal government. This was the policy of Otis and his associates. From the reelection of Mr. Jefferson to

the election of John Quincy Adams, we may say to the election of Andrew Jackson, the consolidation party were not the Federalists, but the Republicans. The Middle and Western States had the preponderating influence, and the policy of New-York and Pennsylvania has been almost from the first that of the General government.

From this we infer that it by no means follows that because a man is a democrat he is not a consolidationist, or that because he is an aristocrat, he cannot be a constitutionalist. The larger States will always have a leaning towards consolidation; and when we look at the great States of the West, and see the rapidity with which they become filled with an active and energetic population, the prospects of the constitutionalists do not appear the brightest. The natural tendency of all these States will be to consolidation, because being the most powerful, they fancy that they will be able to wield the Federal government in their own favor.

One thing is now certain, that the increase of the powers of the Federal Government is unfavorable to the growth of Democracy. The action of that government, the moment it steps beyond its constitutional limits, is to favor business at the expense of labor, and to benefit the capitalist instead of the operative. Hence, it follows that every democrat *ought* to be a constitutionalist. The elements, which go naturally to form the Constitutional Party, are then first the small States, which in a Consolidated Government would become insignificant; second the Slave-holding States, which have no security for their peculiar institutions but in upholding State sovereignty; and third the Democracy, the real friends of Equal Rights.

Hitherto the Democracy of the Middle and Western States have not been constitutionalists, from the mistaken notion, that it was through the Federal Government, and not the State Governments, that they were to carry out their principles. They must now look and see that the more they strengthen that Government, as it can act on them only through its measures touching



Trade, and the Currency, through its general Financial operations, the more power will they throw into the hands of the capitalists and business men of the country, and consequently the greater the burdens they will impose upon the laborer. If our friends in those States will hold up this view, if they will present this consideration as they may, there is some hope that even in them they will be able to rally the Democracy around the standard of the Constitution.

The smaller States must also be made to see that it is for their interest to resist the tendency to consolidation, that their political existence depends on their supporting the Constitution. This is by no means difficult to show, and consequently it will not be difficult to rally them under the Flag of State Rights. The Slave-holding States have, from the nature of their State institutions, a strong interest in adhering to the Constitution. If they do, we are safe, touching the Union.

We call then for a Constitutional Party, which shall be composed of the smaller States, the Slave-holding States, and of the real Democracy of the country, and by Democracy we now mean the real friends of Equal Rights and Social Progress. If these all unite, as they may, on the broad platform of the Constitution, they will constitute a majority in the Union, and will be able to resist effectually the tendency to consolidation. But without the strictest union, touching all questions coming under the cognizance of the General Government, of these three elements, the consolidationists will carry the day, and the consequences will be most disastrous to the whole country, and fatal to the cause of Liberty.

As a Party of the Union, we call upon the three elements we have enumerated to unite on the ground of the Constitution, and under the Flag of State Rights. To the South we say, in the name of the Northern Democracy, unite with us, to prevent the Northern Capitalists, and Business-men of the Middle and Western States from encroaching on the Constitution, and

we will resist all efforts of the Abolitionists to reach the question of Slavery through the action of the Federal Government. Slavery we cannot advocate, for we can see no affinity between Slavery and Democracy. We shall undoubtedly speak out unquestioned, and unobstructed, in favor of universal freedom to universal man. But if you will be faithful to the Constitution, we also will be faithful to it, and adopt no methods, countenance no methods, of interfering with Slavery in your dominions, which we might not legally adopt in regard to it in the dominions of England or France. On this ground, and on these conditions, we meet you. But if you desert us, if you side with the business population of the other sections of the country, and aid them in establishing a National Bank, in laying a Protective Tariff, and assuming directly or indirectly the State Debts, all of which measures are unauthorized by the Constitution, you may rest assured that the Democracy in one solid phalanx will go against your institutions. If no Constitutional barriers will hold you back, none will hold them back. They feel sore towards you now. They have defended you firmly, sacrificed much for the Constitution in which you had as much at stake as they ; but they feel that you have been neither true to them nor to yourselves. This is a dangerous feeling for them to indulge, and unless you go *en masse* for the Constitution, you must not be surprised if they go *en masse* against Slavery. We, for ourselves, shall recommend no such method of retaliation ; nay, we shall do all in our power to prevent it. But we know enough of human nature, to know that no power on earth could succeed in preventing it. You must not think that we defend Slavery on principle, that we love the institution. There is not a democrat north of Mason and Dixon's Line, that does not loathe it, and believe it a crime against Humanity. We refrain from meddling with it, simply because it is a matter which concerns States of which we are not citizens, because we can reach it by no Constitutional action, and because we believe Liberty is more interested at present in preserving

the Constitution, in maintaining State Rights, than in attempting the doubtful good of emancipating the slave, without making any provision for him after his fetters have been knocked off. But when the Constitution is once broken down, when it has become a dead letter, and the Federal Government has become through the triumph of the Money Power a Consolidated Government, the paramount and only efficient government of the country, what then is to hold us back? What then will avail the exhortations, the expostulations of men who have all their lives long been preaching up Equal Rights?

The consolidationists will aim at three measures. They will seek to establish a National Bank, to impose a Protective Tariff, and to assume the State Debts, by distributing the proceeds of the Public Lands, as they will term it, but the Surplus Revenue, as we term it, among the States. In other words they will raise by high taxes a surplus revenue, which surplus they will distribute among the States to enable the States to pay their debts, or at least sustain their credit. Here is their policy.

Now this Policy the friends of the Constitution must resist. Whether the whig party will attempt these measures, as a party or not, we pretend not to determine. But that they will be attempted by a large and powerful party, we hold to be beyond a doubt. These measures are all unconstitutional. They must then be resisted, firmly, successfully resisted, or the Union is destroyed. Look to it then, the South, look to it then, small States of the Union, look to it, Democrats, that ye be not any of you seduced into their support.

We have stated what must be the principal elements of the Constitutionalists. We now say that in the present crisis their main efforts must be directed to defeating these three measures. This is our principal work. We must maintain the Independent Treasury, we must support Free Trade, afford no countenance to a National Bank, suffer the Federal Government to

form no connexion directly or indirectly with the Paper Money System, keep down the Revenues to the wants of the Government, and leave the States to redeem their own Bonds.

This, for the present, must be the Policy of the friends of the Constitution. And to this must be added, as soon as may be, two other measures of a less negative character; one a disposition of the Public Lands, according to some plan similar to the one recommended by Mr. Calhoun; the other a change in the mode of Taxation, from the present system of Indirect Taxation, to that of Direct Taxation. These two measures are loudly called for, and will be found absolutely necessary, if we mean to maintain a federative government, and public morality. They are measures of some import, and they will be found to reach far. We shall avail ourselves of an early opportunity to discuss them at length; at present we can only indicate them, and give it as our opinion, that they must make up an integral part of the policy of that party which shall rally around the Flag of the Union, and seek to preserve the Constitution in its purity and force.

Will the Constitutionalists by adopting the policy here indicated, be able to succeed? Will they command a majority throughout the Union? We know not, ask not. By adopting this policy and contending for it in an open, manly manner, with earnestness and solemn intent, they will deserve success; they will be on the side of justice, in the right; and it is better to be defeated with the right than to triumph with the wrong. We should rarely trouble ourselves with the question of success; if we can only be sure that we have found out the Right, and done our best to sustain it, we may leave results with a calm confidence to Him to whom they belong.

We, however, readily admit that success will not be obtained without an effort. Apparently the consolidationists, the representatives of the Money Power, have now possession of the Government; and we do not fan-

cy that they will be dislodged without a long and severe struggle. As yet, history, so far as we are acquainted, presents no instance of a political contest, in which man has remained the victor over property. Sometimes commercial capital has triumphed over landed capital, plebeian wealth over patrician wealth; but simple naked Humanity over wealth itself, never. If we succeed now it will be the first time in the history of civilization. Nevertheless, we are not without hope. We believe that the interests of our country are so diverse, that man in this contest will not be utterly naked; but that the influence of a considerable portion of the capital of the country may be, after all, on his side. That we must struggle hard, is no objection. In these dull times, it is well to have something to struggle for; otherwise we should remain children always, and never know the virtue there is in manhood. A cause is not desperate because it cannot be won without difficulty, without effort, without sacrifice. Human nature loves the effort, pants for the struggle, as the hart for the water brooks, and joys in the sacrifice. It asks always for an occasion to display its power to do, to dare, to suffer, to prove that its old heroic energy is not exhausted. We have great faith in the heroism of human nature, little in its selfishness. The victory which demands sacrifice is easier won, than that to which interest alone prompts. Take your stand openly and truly on the side of God, Truth, Justice, Man, and you carry all hearts with you; and the greater the opposition you have to encounter, the more enthusiasm shall you enlist in your favor. Heaven is stronger than Hell, and God is a better Captain than the Devil.

Thus far we have spoken of the Policy to be pursued by the friends of the Federal Constitution, the Policy necessary to preserve the Federative Character of the Union, the Independency of the States, and an open field for the friends of Equal Rights to adopt within their respective States such measures as they



shall judge most likely to emancipate the Proletary, ennoble Labor, and realize Equality in our social relations as well as in our political relations. We turn now to the States, to the Policy which should be adopted by the true friends of democracy.

The democratic party, in its character of a *democratic* party, can properly in this country be only a State party, a party restricted in its operations to a single State. Doubtless the action of the Democracy of one State will have no little influence on that of another, and in general the policy which the Democracy may adopt in one State is that which ought to be adopted in all the States ; but we in Massachusetts, for instance, can have no direct action on the policy pursued by other States, any more than on the policy pursued by Foreign Nations. Under the relation we are now considering them, they are Foreign Nations to one another, Free, Sovereign, Independent States, in no sense responsible one to another. We may demand of all the States that they adhere to the Constitution, and adopt through the Federal Government the policy we have decided to be Constitutional ; for in this sense they are a single body politic ; but we can demand only of the citizens of our own State a democratic policy. In the bosom of our own State, we may urge the most radical democracy, and as democrats we are guilty, if we do not ; but we cannot urge it any where else. As democrats then we have nothing to do with the internal policy of other States, nor are we accountable for the State policy pursued in other States by those with whom we act on questions of general policy. We know them only as a Federal Party, not as a State Party.

We are particular in marking this distinction between a Federal party and a State party, between Constitution-  
alists and Democrats, because it is generally overlooked, and because the consequences of overlooking it are none of the best. At present the States are regarded by the great body of the people as mere departments, or prefectures, of one grand consolidated republic. Few comparatively look upon the Federal Govern-

ment and the State governments as coördinate governments. The Federal government is supreme. Federal politics absorb everything ; and so little is the true nature of the Union understood, that we presume not a few of our readers will fancy that, when we speak of Federal politics, we are talking of the views and dogmas of the old Federal Party, represented by its great leader Alexander Hamilton. Rarely will it occur to them that with us a man may be, nay should be, both a Federalist and a Democrat, — a Federalist touching the Union, a Democrat touching the States. But let this pass. The State counts for nothing in our political contests. In the bosom of the States themselves, of the towns and parishes even, Federal politics decide everything. A man's fitness to be a parish priest, a selectman, a pathmaster, is determined among us mainly by his views of Federal politics. Rarely does the election of a State, County, or Town Officer, in the Northern and Middle States, turn on local politics. Politicians calculate the votes of a State for President by its votes for town officers, supervisors, school-committee men, and constables.

Nor is this all. We urge sometimes the good citizens of our State to vote for a certain candidate for President of the United States, because we are in favor of administering the government of the State economically, or because we are or are not in favor of a certain rail-road or bridge, or of a certain police regulation. And then we urge the same citizens to vote for our candidates for State officers, because they are in favor of our Presidential candidate, or of our views of Federal policy. Admirable logic ! Then again, we hold the members of a given Federal party in one State responsible for the measures pursued by members of the same party in other States in regard to the action of their State government. We are not allowed to be democratic in one State, because those who agree with us in another State, on general politics, are anti-democratic in the bosom of their own State. The consequences of this are bad.

The administration party for instance, as a Federal party, has been in the main constitutional. Its measures have been just and proper; and it has deserved the support of all the friends of the Constitution. But in the bosom of the States themselves in regard to State legislation, it has been as anti-democratic as the whigs themselves; and, perhaps, to this fact, more than to any other, should be attributed its late disastrous defeat. It has called the whigs the bank party, and urged us to oppose them on that ground; but has it, on the other hand, been an anti-bank party? It has condemned the whigs; for advocating paper money, but has it ever opposed paper money? It has opposed a United States Bank; but on the broad ground of opposition to a paper currency? Has it not contended for State banks as strenuously, if not as openly, as have the whigs? What, then, has availed its opposition to a national bank? Aside from certain constitutional and political reasons, what arguments can you bring against a national bank, that do not bear with equal force against State banks? Nay, once admit the policy of a paper circulation, and it is questionable whether you are not unwise in opposing a national bank. If the States are to be suffered to issue, either directly or indirectly, through institutions of their own creating, a paper currency like the one we now have, it may be contended with justice, that a national bank is needed; nay, all but indispensable. Nothing can be worse than as many different currencies as there are States, and as many different currencies there will be, if the currency be left to State legislation. A principal reason for desiring a union of the States was, that we might have a currency which should not vary with each State, but be of uniform value throughout all the States. The people, in order to secure this end, placed the whole subject of the currency under the control of the Federal government. If we have decided that our currency shall be paper, assuredly it should come under the control of the Federal government. The interests of trade, nay, of industry, of labor, imperiously demand that the currency of Massachusetts and

of Mississippi should be of the Same value. Does anybody believe this can be the case, so long as our currency is paper, and this paper is issued by State institutions, and subject to the action of the State legislatures? It may be truly asserted, that a national bank cannot, under any circumstances, do much to remedy the evil; but there is no question but it can, to some degree, mitigate it. Its own notes will pass current, at the same value, throughout the Union, and thus afford a medium of exchange between the remote sections.

Now the administration party has opposed the United States Bank, without opposing paper money; it has sustained the paper money policy, while it has opposed the only measure which can possibly render that policy in any degree tolerable. This has been its error. If you have a paper currency, you are bound to place it under the control of the Federal government, by subjecting it to the direct or indirect action of that government. But the administration party has said, no, we will retain a paper currency, but we will leave it to the States to furnish it. Where, then, is the sound and uniform currency, for the furnishing of which the Federal government was created? Assuming that a paper currency is to be the currency of the country, Mr. Webster's arguments on this point are unanswerable, and have been so considered by a majority of the people of the United States.

The administration party in all the States, unless we except Massachusetts, has been as decidedly in favor of paper money as the whig party. There is nothing against it in any of the Messages of Andrew Jackson or Martin Van Buren; Senators Buchanan, Grundy, and King have taken unwearied pains to show that they are in favor of State banks, and what they call a mixed currency. Mr. Benton, the great antagonist of *the Bank*, has never said a syllable, as we can find, against paper money. The only opposition we have seen to the policy, in either branch of Congress, has come from Mr. Calhoun and some of his State Rights friends.

Leaving Congress and coming into the States, we find

the administration party, as a State party, nowhere opposing paper money. In Pennsylvania, the Governor, a friend of the administration, is also a friend of the banks; and the legislature which chartered the United States Bank of Pennsylvania, contained a majority of members friendly to Mr. Van Buren; in Ohio, the Governor, elected by the administration party, in his Message to the legislature last winter, sustained, on principle, at great length, and not without ability, the policy of paper money. Michigan has been all but ruined by banks, created while it was an administration State; Mississippi and Alabama have fared not much better, to say nothing of Illinois and Louisiana. The banking system of New York is a creation of the same party, and the whole influence of the New York banks was brought to bear against a national bank, and in favor of General Jackson and Mr. Van Buren, till the explosion of the Deposit System. In our own state, no man could maintain, prior to 1837, his standing in the administration party, if he were known to be opposed to paper money, and in favor of an exclusively metallic currency. We had our democratic banks, and the leading men of the party seemed to hold that banks were good things, providing they were managed by members of the democratic party. In fact, in no State in the Union, has the administration party assumed the character of an anti-paper-money party. Individuals there may have been, who, *sub rosa*, would tell you that they were inclining to the belief, that we must return to a metallic currency, but the opposition to paper money has been purely an individual, and not a party opposition.

Several other matters, which have been made objections to the whigs, have also been encouraged by the administration party. This party has favored State loans, and aided in contracting those ruinous State debts, of which it now complains so much. The administration States have plunged as deeply into debt, to say the least, as the whig states. Witness New York, Pennsylvania, Mississippi, Alabama, Illinois. Massachusetts, a thor-



ough-going whig State, has by no means been so rash ; and furthermore, the policy of lending the credit of this Commonwealth to corporations has not been a purely whig measure. It has been sustained by some of our most influential administration men.

Now, as the confusion of State and Federal politics has made the party, as a Federal party, responsible for its action, as a State party, these facts have given it the appearance of gross inconsistency. As a State party it has had nothing to distinguish it from the whig party, unless it be professing more and aiming at less. As a Federal party, it has been tried not by the Constitution, but by its character as a State party. Its Federal policy, it has been seen, retaining its State policy, would be ruinous to trade, to business, and no advantage to labor. It, therefore, has had nothing to recommend it, and the people have decided against it. The people have not decided in favor of paper money, but simply, that, *if we have paper money, it shall not be left to the contradictory policy of State legislatures, but be under the control of the Federal government.* The Federal policy and the State policy of the party have not been harmonious, but parts of opposite systems. This has lost the party. The people are excellent logicians, great advocates for consistency, and require you always to be systematic, in whatever you propose. You cannot make them support one system in relation to one subject, and another system in relation to another subject. They demand Bank or no Bank ; a paper currency of the best character the country can furnish, or a metallic currency. They will not lean toward a metallic currency for the purpose of overthrowing a national bank, and toward a paper currency for the purpose of sustaining State banks. They cannot understand why the arguments which bear in favor of or against the one, do not bear equally in favor of or against the other.

The difficulty we have here pointed out can be removed, under our complex system of government, only by dissevering, as much as may be, the connexion which

has heretofore existed between the politics of the State, and the politics of the Union, and by making a man's views on Federal politics no criterion of his merits on questions of State politics. The doctrine of State Rights will hardly be maintained till we have done this. The tendency to consolidation, most to be feared, is not in the action of the Federal government, but in the conduct and sentiments of parties.

Keeping in view the distinction we have designated, we may speak on State policy, without committing in the least the friends of the Constitution in other States, whose views are different from our own. We hold them not responsible for the policy we advocate for our own State, and they must not hold us responsible for the policy they may choose to advocate. In the bosom of the several States, we are citizens of independent nations, in no sense accountable to one another.

In coming into the individual State, we can be at no loss to discover the policy marked out for the Democracy. The first question claiming our attention is undoubtedly that of the currency. This in itself is a miserable question, and one likes not to meddle with it; and yet its solution must be sought. If wise men neglect it, it will fall into the hands of fools, who will make bad work with it. We cannot blink it out of sight; we must meet it, and dispose of it. What disposition shall we make of it?

In the first place, we assume it as a settled point, that the control of the currency, so far as it falls under the action of government, is conceded by the States to the Union. The people of the United States wished, by the Union, to create for the citizens of all the States the same facilities of trade and business intercourse with one another, which they would have had, if they had all been citizens of one and the same State. They had also experienced great difficulties from the different policies pursued by the several States with regard to the currency. The States, each according to its own caprice, made what it pleased a legal tender for the payment of debts, and emitted its bills of credit almost

without limit. The currency therefore was constantly fluctuating, and varied in value as you passed from one State to another. The consequences of this on trade need not be told. The debts due from the citizens of one State to those of another, were of uncertain value; and when collected must be collected in a currency from which little or nothing could be realized, that the creditor could use in his own State, or at any point out of the State to which the debtor belonged.

The evils thus experienced the States sought to remedy, first, by surrendering the control of the currency to the Federal Government. By this they hoped to secure the same currency for all the States, a currency of the same value in every section of the Union. Secondly, to avoid the ruinous fluctuations of the currency, and to prevent the States from substituting any other currency than that of the Union, the States gave to the Federal Government no power to establish any other currency than that of gold and silver, and denied to themselves the right to create another, or to make anything else, a legal tender for the payment of debts.

From these facts, we infer, first, that under our present Constitution, the subject of the currency is surrendered entirely to the Federal Government; and second, that the Federal government has no right to establish any other than a hard money currency.

Now, under our present banking system, we have virtually, if not literally, a paper currency; and this currency is furnished by the States, and not by the general Government; and it is not only subject to ruinous fluctuations, but is of very unequal values, the currency of one section of the Union being at times five, ten, fifteen, even twenty per cent. better than that of another. Under the State Bank system, we have then a reproduction of the precise evils, against which the framers of the Constitution intended to guard. The introduction of another than a hard money currency is permitted, and the duty of furnishing the currency is resumed by the States.

In this case, of two things one ; either the Federal Government must assume the control of these State banks, and regulate their issues by means of a grand bank of its own, or in some other way ; or these banks must be given up. Given a paper money currency as the policy of the Country, we agree with Mr. Webster, that it should either be furnished, or what is the same thing, regulated by the Federal Government. But under the Constitution the Federal Government has no power to authorize, or to recognise in any way or shape anything like a paper currency. The only currency known to it is that of Gold and Silver. A national bank, or the furnishing of a paper currency by the Federal Government is then out of the question, if we mean to retain the Constitution. Besides, the establishment of a national bank would consolidate the money power, and give to the Federal Government a power it was never intended to have, a power which would make it the only efficient government of the Country, enable it to swallow up the States, and with them the liberties of the individual citizen. A paper currency furnished by the Federal Government, then, must not be thought of. But the States have no right to furnish a currency at all. They have surrendered that right. Then they have no right to create banks with the power to furnish it. Then the State banks, so far as they are banks of issue, are really if not technically unconstitutional, and therefore should cease to exist.

There is then no course for the Democracy to take, but either to consent to a national bank, or to abandon State banks. The first they will not do, and ought not to do. Then they must do the latter. Then they must take their stand openly, decidedly, and at once, against the State banks, so far as they are authorized to issue their notes as a circulation. In other words, the Democracy must take its stand against paper money, and against all institutions created for furnishing it. They must go for an exclusively metallic currency. Have they the nerve for this ? The people have ; but whether politicians have or have not, remains to be

seen. But if they have not, they may as well surrender at once to the enemies of the Democracy, and no longer keep up even a show of opposition.

Men on 'Change will no doubt smile at our simplicity in demanding a purely metallic currency, and tell us such a currency is impracticable, and undesirable ; but in return we can assure them that we rarely go on 'Change to learn either democracy or political economy. The men who congregate there, are not usually the men whom God calls to enlighten the nations. They may understand the routine of business, but of the principles which lie at the bottom of their practice, their bearing on public morals and public prosperity, they know in general nothing. They are so busy in gathering up the acorns lying on the ground, that they have no time to cast their eyes up to the branches from which they have fallen, much less to investigate the laws by which they have been produced. If they were wise enough to afford valuable instructions on the currency, they were not foolish enough to encourage the growth of the system they now contend for.

We may be told that there is not gold and silver enough in the world to do the business with, that is now done. Very well ; then do less business, and, perhaps, the world will be no worse off. But this pretence is shallow, and not worth refuting. The real objection is not what our business men allege. The difficulty is not that there is too little gold and silver in the world, but too little in their pockets. Increase the amount in the world a thousand fold, and their embarrassments would remain undiminished. Nor is this all. The use of paper does by no means supply the place of a metallic medium. The furnishing of paper money is a mere business transaction, requiring in the last analysis and absorbing in fact as much gold and silver as any other kind of business to an equal amount. The paper currency is not ultimate, and ends no transaction. It serves merely to defer the time of settlement ; but it can pay no balances. The payment of balances, for which alone money is needed in the transaction of business, must be



paid, if paid at all, in gold and silver, in like manner as if no paper had been used ; with this difference only, that these balances are rated according to the paper standard, and consequently require a larger amount of gold and silver to extinguish them, than would have been requisite, had gold and silver constituted the currency.

The difficulty, which our business men seek to obviate by paper money, is by no means a recondite one. They wish to buy and sell, and amass by the operation a fortune. But they have no money, with which to make their purchases, and no property which they can exchange for money. They have simply the faculty of buying and selling. They would buy and ship to England a cargo of cotton, and not pay the planter for it till it is sold in England and the returns realized. The merchant's means of payment must be obtained by the sale of the cotton purchased. What he wants, then, is credit. This credit, for various reasons, the planter will not give him. His simple course, then, is, to go to the capitalist, or to the bank, and borrow the means of paying the planter. It is well for him to obtain this loan, and no harm to the community. Credits to this extent are needed, and must be had, unless we would leave the whole business transactions of the world to a few moneyed men, a thing by no means desirable.

Banks are unquestionably, in this view of the case, necessary, and worthy of encouragement. If the business man can obtain the loan he asks for, it is an advantage to business, and to labor, for labor in certain respects has interests in common with business. A ready market for the products of labor is of as much importance to the laborer, as to the trader. In order to command this market, for the products of labor of any one country, it is necessary to open to them the markets of the world. And to do this requires an energy, an enterprise on the part of business men, which can be rarely looked for, except in young men, who have their fortunes to make. Facilities to these should unques-

tionably be extended, and for this banks, private or public, are necessary.

The Democracy, then, should not object to credit, nor to banks. We are willing the merchant should obtain a loan, and purchase his cargo of cotton, and not cancel his loan till the sale of the cotton has furnished him the means. All this can be assented to without difficulty. We would assign no limits to the credit he or others may obtain, but the means of those who grant it. So long as a bank loans only its actual capital, or real capital in its possession, we utter no complaint. Because then the planter is actually paid for his cotton, and the losses, if any, fall on the speculator and the bank, where they ought to fall. But by means of paper money, that is, by allowing the bank to loan its notes instead of loaning real money, the bank is enabled to furnish credits beyond its means of redemption. It ceases, the moment its notes exceed its actual amount of gold and silver on hand, to be a money-lender, and becomes a money-borrower, and dependent on the success of its debtors in their speculations, for the means to pay its creditors. If these speculations miscarry, the bank miscarries, and the actual loss falls, not on the speculator, for he had nothing to lose, nor on the bank, for it never furnished any real capital, but on the producer, who had exchanged his products for the notes of the bank. This is the feature in our banking system, which should be stricken out.

We have instanced the case of the speculator in cotton, who, wishing to speculate in that article, can only do it on credit. Now, it may be that this speculator can obtain no credit at the bank, or it may be, that the advance on the price paid for his cotton, at which he can sell it, will not be sufficient to furnish him a living profit, and at the same time pay the interest on his loan at the bank. What now shall be done? He, and four or five more in the same situation, but engaged in different business transactions, come together, petition the legislature, obtain a charter for a bank, with a privilege of issuing their notes to as great an amount, practically, as they can keep out.

They pay in the capital of the bank in stock notes, and now substituting their notes as a bank for their notes as individuals, purchase cotton and other products on their own credit. In this case they unite in themselves the character of speculators, borrowers, and lenders. They are their own bankers. The planter takes the notes of their bank for his cotton, which he sells to them as individuals, and the farmer for his wheat. But if they fail in their operations, as speculators, then they must fail as debtors of the bank, and then fail as the bank or debtors of the public, and what then has the planter and farmer received for their wheat and cotton?

But one knot of four or five individuals have obtained a bank, and by its means are commanding the products of industry with the same ease they would, had they been men of real capital. Other individuals, seeing this, say, why not we have a bank also? So these other individuals petition, and obtain a bank, and go through the same process. Another set of individuals do the same, till your whole State is covered over with banks, and the land deluged with bank notes. During this time the rage for speculation goes ever increasing; fortunes are made in a day; men who were poor clerks yesterday are millionaires to-day; slow but gradual gains are despised; honest industry is contemned, and all the world rushes into trade. But this cannot last. Balances must be paid, and paid in gold and silver; but gold and silver for this there is not enough to be come at. The few individuals, who, during the fever of speculation had taken good care not to have many outstanding balances to settle off, come out with a princely fortune, while the great mass of the active business men find themselves where they began; and the planters and farmers, find that they have nothing to show for the products they have parted with.

This is the inevitable result of a system of paper money, and this is a result no honest man can desire. This is carrying the credit system to a ruinous extent, and making that, which, within its natural limits, is a great good, one of the greatest of evils. Credit to this extent is

not needed, and should not be furnished. We must, then, abolish the paper money system, and compel the banks to limit their loans to their actual resources. The evil of banking begins the moment the bank becomes a borrower from the public at large, and this it does the moment it issues its notes beyond the actual amount of gold and silver in its possession. Beyond that amount its loans are loans of its credit, not of its money. Now we are willing that credits should be obtained by the business men to the full extent of the actual means of those who furnish them. This is the natural limit to the credit system, and beyond which it can never be safe. When extended beyond this limit, the business of the country is unnaturally stimulated, and rendered unhealthy ; its frame becomes bloated, and sudden dissolution is always to be apprehended.

We come, then, to this conclusion ; the Democracy need not oppose banking, but it should oppose paper money ; it need not oppose credit, without which all business must come to a stand-still, but it should oppose all artificial means for extending credits beyond the ability of those who furnish them to redeem them in gold and silver. We make no objections to banks of deposit, of exchange, transfer of credits, and of discount ; we simply ask that all discounts be made in the legal currency of the country.

This, if it were but the existing order, we shall be told, would unquestionably be far preferable to our present state of things. But, then, it is useless to contend for it. So large a proportion of the people are in debt, that they will never submit to the sacrifice necessary for introducing it. This may be so. Yet the losses to the debtor class of the community, we do not believe, would be greater than they have been for the last few years. Then, again, can we not arrive at a tolerably exact estimate of the per cent., at which this change would appreciate the currency ? Why not, then, require the creditor, in the case of all debts contracted prior to the change, and estimated in a depreciated paper currency, to deduct this per cent. from the nominal

amount claimed? This would be just to both parties, requiring the debtor to pay only the amount of value he had stipulated to pay, and giving the creditor all the values he had ever a right to demand.

But, if we go against all paper money, what shall we do with existing banks? Repeal, of course, that clause in their charters, which allows them to issue their notes as a currency, and require the immediate redemption, in gold and silver, of the notes they have now in circulation. This, we admit, is a bold measure, and cannot be adopted at once, without causing great suffering. But what of that? It is better to take a medicine, which will expel a lingering disease and restore us to health, although its immediate operation shall give us the gripes, than it is to be always sick. What is true in this respect of the individual, is of the community. It is better to feel the full shock of the evil at once, and then to be ever after free from it, than it is to be constantly debilitated by it. But be this as it may, a healthy state of business cannot be obtained at a less expense.

Having disposed of the currency question, and by annihilating all banks of circulation, brought the currency to the constitutional standard, we must extirpate all monopolies, not necessarily all corporations. Corporations are useful, and answer many desirable purposes. All that Democracy can ask in regard to them is, that they conceal no monopoly principle, that they confer on the corporator no privileges, which he did not possess or may not possess as an individual. We would, therefore, insist that the individual property of all the corporators should be holden for the debts of the corporation.

Corporations, for manufacturing purposes, are not strictly anti-democratic, when their charters confer no monopoly; and yet they exert an anti-democratic influence. Their tendency at present is unwholesome. Nevertheless, they are founded on a principle destined to play an important part in the business of production, that of *associated labor*. They are but a feeble, a most imper-



fect embodiment of this principle ; but they contain the germ of it, and we should therefore seek to perfect them, and not to destroy them. When we can make them corporations, as we may, of operatives and employers in the same persons, and not of employers alone, they will be great blessings.

Banks are at present monopolies, for they have the privilege of making a use of their credit, which is denied to individuals. But when they cease to be banks of issue, and restrict themselves to the ordinary functions of banking, that is, to negotiating loans and exchanges, they will not necessarily be monopolies, and may be suffered to exist. If, however, they are found to have any privilege, which an individual has not, or which he can have only by becoming a member of them as bodies corporate, they should be modified, and this principle taken away,

Monopolies disposed of, many other questions will come up. The reforms we need are in very few cases political. By political reforms, we understand reforms in the organization of the state. A few of these may, perhaps, be needed. The right of suffrage needs some extension, and, perhaps, the judiciary some constitutional changes. But the principal questions which come up relate not to political, but legislative reforms. There are several of these, which we intended to specify, but we have already exceeded our limits. We can only add, that we must complete the abolition of imprisonment for debt, and revise our laws relating to the collection of debts. The expenses annually incurred by the collection of debts by law exceed the amount of debts so collected. These expenses are borne chiefly by the debtor class, already embarrassed ; and serve to maintain a set of legal harpies, which public morality would willingly dispense with altogether. Why should not all ordinary debts be regarded as mere individual matters, which are to be adjusted by individuals, without calling in the aid of society ? Why not leave the whole subject to individual probity and honor ? If so left, the demand

for these virtues would be increased, and thereby public and private morality be promoted.

Reforms in the criminal code are demanded. We cannot specify them now; we can only say that our criminal code should be made to harmonize with the principle, that human governments have no right to punish, except for the purpose of restraint from actual violence, done either to individual rights, or social.

In fine, we must insist upon a system of education, combining industry with science and literature. Or, in one word, a system of industrial schools, in which some branch of industry shall be pursued, in connexion with literature and science. Schools of this kind are needed for ennobling labor. When all the children of the commonwealth labor, labor will be honorable. They are needed for the promotion and preservation of health. A few hours' labor every day are essential to the health of the student. They are also needed in order to enable each child in the commonwealth to have access to the best education the community can afford. They may easily be made self-supporting schools, and cost the state nothing, and then education may be really universal.

Some other things we would specify, but we have said enough. What we have said indicates that the Democracy has a great work to perform, and that it cannot engage too soon, nor be too much in earnest to perform it.

Doubtless, some will dissent from the policy we have marked out, the measures we have suggested. Be it so. We have merely given our own views, freely and boldly. We have told what we honestly think the Democracy should attempt, stated the ground on which it should rally, and some of the measures, on which it should insist. If others think us wrong, wild, rash, impracticable, or wicked, all we have to say is, let them bring forward something better. But, whatever they have to propose, let them be speedy. Time flies. The enemy is already in our midst, has already entrenched himself in some of our strong holds, and threatens to

bring us under his accursed dominion. Friends of the Constitution and of Equal Rights, be on the alert. You have no time to waste. Now, or never, must you recover your kingdom, and establish your empire. Now, or never, must you seize upon a true democratic policy, and stake everything on one bold effort to save the Constitution, and establish the reign of Justice and Equality.

---

ART. IV. — *An Address of the Workingmen of Charlestown, Mass., to their Brethren throughout the Commonwealth and the Union.* 1840. 8vo. pp. 18.

THIS Address was published on the eve of the late elections, and has no doubt been thrown aside with the mass of ephemeral productions, which they called forth; but it seems to us to have been designed not merely for electioneering purposes, and to be worthy of grave consideration, even now that the elections are over. We cannot perceive that it has lost much in interest or appropriateness.

In 1829, the workingmen, mechanics, and other laborers, in the city of New-York, organized themselves into a party, put forth a declaration of principles, and succeeded in electing one of their men to the State Legislature. Their movement created considerable excitement at the time; and was speedily followed by similar movements in various sections of the Union. There was even a moment, when this party seemed not unlikely to become a dominant party in the country. It was sustained by several leading journals of the then National Republican party, as well as by several of its own, conducted with great spirit and ability, and somewhat extensively circulated. But as an organized party, it proved to be short-lived, and soon became almost entirely merged in one or both of the great political parties, which then divided the country.

This workingmen's party owed its origin to the insufficiency of the democratic party of the time to meet the new democratic wants of the country. The questions, which had given rise to the old Federal and Republican parties of '98, had in 1829 well nigh lost their hold on the popular mind ; and new questions, of far graver import, had come up, or were struggling to come up, for practical solution. The Federal and Republican parties were purely *political* parties, and the questions on which they divided related almost entirely to the organization of the State. At the epoch of the adoption of the Constitution, men honestly differed in their views of the form which should be given to the government. Hamilton and his friends, believing it the main duty of government to provide for itself, its own permanence and stability, were for giving it as much of an aristocratic cast, as the habits of our people would permit. They wished to protect the government from the fickleness and turbulence of the Democracy. Thomas Jefferson and his friends, inspired by an ardent love of freedom, and reposing a generous confidence in the people, leaned the other way, and sought to establish a pure Democracy. But in 1829, the controversy between these two parties had virtually subsided. Both parties had accepted the democratic form of government ; each claimed to be the democratic party ; and it was no easy matter to say whether the claims of the one were better founded than those of the other. Democracy, as a form of government, had triumphed over all its enemies, and become the established creed of the country, which nobody thought of disturbing.

But Democracy, as a form of government, *political* Democracy, as we call it, could not be the term of popular aspiration. Regarded in itself, without reference to anything ulterior, it is no better than the aristocratic form of government, or even the monarchical. Universal suffrage and eligibility, the expression of perfect equality before the State, and which with us are very nearly realized, unless viewed as means to an end, are not worth contending for. What avails it, that all men

are equal before the State, if they must stop there? If under a Democracy, aside from mere politics, men may be as unequal in their social condition, as under other forms of government, wherein consist the boasted advantages of your Democracy? Is all possible good summed up in suffrage and eligibility? Is the millennium realized, when every man may vote and be voted for? Yet this is all that political Democracy, reduced to its simplest elements, proposes. Political Democracy, then, can never satisfy the popular mind. This Democracy is only one step, — a necessary step, — in its progress. Having realized equality before the State, the popular mind passes naturally to equality before Society. It seeks and accepts *political* Democracy only as a means to *social* Democracy, and it cannot fail to attempt to realize equality in men's social condition, when it has once realized equality in their political condition.

But prior to 1829, no attempt had been made to realize this social Democracy; no party had recognised it; no prominent politician had avowed it. Parties and politicians were continuing on in their old beaten track, repeating till hoarse their old war-cries, without once dreaming, that to the popular mind these war-cries had lost their significance. They perceived not, that the day, when the cry of Federal or Republican could decide the fate of an election, had gone by. Indeed, up to this day, our politicians have not perceived this, and many is the friend of the Administration, who, during the late canvass, has thought to annihilate the supporters of General Harrison by shouting Hartford Convention, and Old Federalism. But this shouting has availed nothing, for the questions laboring in the public mind are not the old political questions which originated the Federal and Republican parties. A new phase of the mighty revolution, which has for the last seven hundred years been going on throughout all Christendom, has come up, and one which our politicians see not even now, but which they especially saw not in 1829. If the political democrats of that time had seen this new phase,



and conformed to it, recognised these new wants, and manifested a desire to meet them, no new party would have been needed, none could have arisen. But as they did not, the friends of progress, and especially they in whom these new wants were the most urgent, were compelled to break away from the political Democrats, and set up for themselves. Hence the Workingmen's Party.

The party failed in consequence of its assuming a name, which seemed to be at war with the end it avowed, and in consequence of the friendship which the other parties soon professed to have for its objects, its principles, and measures. The name, Workingmen, was either too unlimited, or too restricted. In one sense, all men in this country are workingmen; in this sense, a workingmen's party is without significance. In another sense, it means only actual operatives, men who have no means of subsistence, but their simple labor; that is to say, the proletariat. But in this sense it includes a large number, who will never make any efforts for themselves, and excludes a large number, who are the most earnest and effective supporters of social Democracy. And moreover, by assuming the name of a particular class of society as the name of the party, it seemed to indicate that the object of the party was to protect a special interest, and all men have a righteous horror of protecting special interests, — unless they be the special interests of the rich and powerful. Then, again, the other parties, especially the administration party, by professing great regard for the workingmen, making them fair promises, and supporting some of their prominent friends, created a feeling that a separate workingmen's party was unnecessary, and as a matter of course prevented the exertions, without which the party could not be sustained. In these considerations, we may possibly discover the secret of its failure.

But, though the workingmen as a party were soon disbanded, the friends of their principles and measures have not become extinct. Social Democracy has been constantly on the spread, and the numbers of its adherents

steadily augmenting. The Address before us seems to have been designed to rally these, by flinging again to the breeze the old Workingmen's Flag of 1829. The social Democrats constitute the main body of the administration party, together with no inconsiderable portion of the supporters of General Harrison. If they could all be drawn out, and united on the same side, they would unquestionably constitute a majority of the voters in the Union. They would then be able to possess themselves of the government, and to use it for the furtherance of their purposes. This, we presume, our Charlestown friends have seen, and therefore have published their Address.

Will these social Democrats rally under the old Workingmen's Flag? We know not, but we hardly think they will. Even the workingmen themselves will rally under their own Flag only to a limited extent. It is no easy matter to induce them to make an effort in their own behalf. They are, in general, much falselier to themselves, than the Aristocracy are to them. With many honorable exceptions, indeed, our workingmen have already become so dependent and servile in their spirit, that not much can be done with them. They are afraid of displeasing their masters, or of losing their employments, and are readiest to distrust those who are readiest to sacrifice themselves for their interests. When the master or agent is out of hearing, they will assent to your propositions, but will change their tone or remain silent, when he is present. They also want confidence in one another; and with their present passions and habits, they seem incapable of acting steadily in concert for any length of time. We, therefore, have no great confidence in the charm of this old Flag. We doubt whether it has any magic, and, therefore, should not ourselves fling it out.

Our policy would be a little different. We believe that all the social Democrats may be drawn out and united; nay, they will and shall be; for so is it written in this nation's destiny. But we find the great body of them already enrolled, and marching under a banner

which seems to us sufficiently appropriate. The administration party has been called by its enemies the Loco-foco party. This term, Loco-foco, has properly belonged only to a portion of the party. The party has been composed of political Democrats, and of social Democrats. To these social Democrats the term *loco-foco* was first applied, and to them alone it belongs, though it has been improperly extended to pretty much the whole party. As the political Democratic party, it has been defeated, and may be considered as good as dead ; but as the Loco-foco party, it is not dead, nor likely to die. Its defeat will send out from its midst all who are unable or unwilling to pass from political Democracy to social Democracy ; but the social Democrats, who constitute three-fourths of the party, will remain, and be the nucleus, as well as the main body of the new party, which must inevitably come up to rule the destinies of the country. These, the real Loco-focos, will not be gathered to any other body, because they themselves constitute a larger body than any other, with which they can have any affinity. Instead, then, of flinging out the old Workingmen's Flag, or patching up and giving again to the breeze the torn ensign of purely political Democracy, we would accept the genuine Loco-foco Flag, already streaming in the wind, and which nobody thinks of pulling down. On this Loco-foco Flag, if we read aright, is inscribed, **EQUALITY BEFORE SOCIETY, AS WE ALREADY HAVE EQUALITY BEFORE THE STATE.** Loco-focoism is social Democracy, as distinguished from political ; and a Loco-foco is a Jeffersonian Democrat, who having realized political equality, passed through one phase of the revolution, now passes on to another, and attempts the realization of social equality, so that the actual condition of men in society shall be in harmony with their acknowledged rights as citizens.

Loco-focoism is, then, the word, and its banner the one, under which we would attempt to rally the Social Democracy, especially since under it are already enrolled the larger division of them. We are also partial to the

term. It was applied to the friends of social equality by their enemies, as a term of reproach, for the purpose of rendering them odious or ridiculous. We would therefore accept it, and make it our battle cry, till its faintest whisper should strike terror into the heart of every man, who would lord it over his brother. It is a good word, and it was applied to the social Democrats because they chose to carry their own light, and not be dependent on their conservative brethren ; because they would not suffer themselves to be kept in darkness, that aspiring chiefs might manage them. We like the term ; we are willing to wear it, and we glory in its significance. It shall be a famous word yet, more so than that of Guelph or Ghibbeline, or Whig or Tory, and like Liberty herself, shall make the "tour of the globe." We would raise aloft then the genuine Loco-foco Flag ; we would let it stream in the wind from every liberty-pole in every town, village, and hamlet in the Union. No dishonor stains it ; it has witnessed no defeat ; it is new, and whole, and strong. Under it we may fight and win the battle of man and society. This we would recommend as the best policy. Nevertheless, the old Workingmen's Flag may have a charm we wot not of. At any rate, with the end these Workingmen have in view, we entirely and heartily sympathize. It is an end to which all modern civilization is tending ; which is hastened by every revolution, whatever may be its apparent termination ; which is sanctioned by religion, and demanded by the blood of the Cross ; for which all good men pray, and labor the world over ; and which no power beneath the Almighty can hinder from being one day attained. Go on, then, whether ye call yourselves Workingmen or Loco-focos. You are marching with Humanity, and you march to victory.

Willing to aid our friends the Workingmen what we can, we copy their Address nearly entire. We think our readers will not object. It appears to us to be written with great calmness and dignity, and evidently by one who spoke from his own deep feelings and firm convictions. Its tone is earnest, grave, and almost solemn.

We commend it to the careful perusal of our readers, belong they to what class of society they may.

“BRETHREN:—The time seems to have arrived, when we, the real workingmen of the country, should pause, and survey our condition; ascertain our actual state, what are our rights, and the means of securing their full enjoyment.

“We are in this country, as in all others, the great majority of the population. We are the real producers. By our toil and sweat, our skill and industry, is produced all the wealth of the community. We have felled the primeval forests of this western world, converted them into fruitful fields, and planted the rose in the wilderness. We have erected these cities and villages which smile where lately was the Indian's wigwam, or the lair of the wild beast. We have called into existence American manufactures, and been the instruments by which Commerce has amassed her treasures; our labor has digged the canals, and constructed the railways, which are intersecting the country in all directions, and opening its resources. We have built and manned the ships which navigate every ocean, and furnished the houses of the rich with all their comforts and luxuries. Our labor has done it all. And yet what is our condition? We toil on from morning to night, from one year's end to another, increasing our exertions with each year, and with each day, and still we are the poor and dependent. Here, as everywhere else, they, who pocket the proceeds of our labor, look upon us as the lower class, and term us the mob. We are but laborers, operatives, *vulgar* workingmen. We are poor. Our wages barely suffice to supply us the necessaries of life. We rarely have either leisure or opportunity to cultivate our minds, or to acquire that general knowledge of men and things, which no human being should grow up without. We are doomed by our position to grow up ignorant, and often in total neglect of all our nobler endowments. Our rights and interests attract no general attention. Legislators have no leisure to attend to our wants. And politicians have no further concern with us, than to wheedle us out of our votes by fair speeches and vague promises. The great concern is to take care of the rich and prosperous, the educated and powerful—of those who fill the high places of society, ride in carriages, sit on cushioned seats, and feast their dainty palates on luxuries culled from every clime. The wants of these are urgent. *Their* rights, privileges, and interests will brook no delay. But we, we, who bear all the burdens of society, pay all the revenues of Government, and the incomes of the rich, why we may go our way till a more convenient season.

“Now, Brethren, against this state of things, we enter a loud, an indignant protest. Our pockets may be empty, our faces may be sunburnt, and our hands may be hard; but we are men, with the souls of men, and the rights of men. There is a spirit within us, that assures us we were not born to be slaves; that we were not made merely to toil and sweat, to endure hunger, and cold, and nakedness, and death, that the few might grow fat on our labors and sufferings, and then turn round and kick us. We feel that we



were made for something better, and that we have a right to aspire to something higher. An apostle has said, "If any man will not work, neither shall he eat." And this we believe should apply to one man as well as to another. Why, if we must bear all the burthens of society, shall we not in common justice enjoy all its blessings?

"Brethren, we have reflected on our condition, and we have come to the conclusion, that it is not the true condition of men. We are made of the same blood with those who work us as they do their horses and oxen, and who value us only for the profit they can derive from our labors. As pure blood courses in our veins as in theirs; as generous, as noble emotions swell our bosoms, and we have by nature capacities, to say the least, every way equal to theirs. Why then are they regarded as the better sort? Why then do they fatten on our labors? Why then are they rich and we poor? Why shall not our condition be as good as theirs? Why shall they call themselves our masters, and work us for their profit?

"Brethren, we have said that we are men. We have then the rights of men—we are then by virtue of our rights, equal to one another, and to all men.

"The rights of men belong to us by virtue of the fact that we are men. We hold them not by the grant of civil society; they are anterior to civil society; and in coming into civil society, we do not surrender them, nor can we be justly deprived of their exercise.

"We hold that every man by virtue of the simple fact that he is a man, a human being, has a right to all the means necessary for the free and full development of all his faculties, and for providing for his moral, intellectual, and physical well-being.

"Before God, all men are equal,—are children of a common parent; for one God hath made them all, and all are his offspring. Before the Gospel all men are equal, for one and the same Saviour hath died for them all; and the same faith, repentance, and means of salvation are preached to them all, and declared to be equally necessary to them all. Before society, then, should all men be regarded as equals. Consequently, the burthens of society and the blessings of society should be shared equally by all.

"Government is not society, but the agent of society. Its true end is to secure to each individual member of society the full enjoyment of his rights, and to ensure the due performance of each one's social duties. It is false to its trust whenever it leaves any individual in a condition below that which is proper to man; whenever any individual is left without the power to protect his rights, and to attain according to his aptitude to the full development of his nature as a moral, intellectual, and physical being.

"Brethren, in saying all this, we say only what all our countrymen admit. Our rights are acknowledged—in words; but what avails the acknowledgment of our *rights*, when we want the *RIGHTS* to maintain them. It is with us a question as to our *RIGHTS*, rather than as to our *RIGHTS*. Nobody dare deny our rights; but our rights are trampled upon, because it is thought we have not the power to punish the aggressor. Here then is the difficulty. We

are men with the rights of men, with rights equal to those of the wealthiest and the proudest; but we are poor men; men obliged to labor for our daily bread; dependent on those who choose to employ us, and compelled by the invincible law of hunger to accept the wages they offer. They hold us then at their mercy, and make us work solely for their profit. Here, not *our rights*, but *our might* fail us.

"How stands the case with us? We labor more hours and with more intensity than we did formerly. We are aided by the discoveries of science, and the introduction of machinery which gives to our labor a thousand fold additional power of production; and yet our condition relatively to the capitalist does by no means become better. There is scarcely a country in Europe where, in proportion to the labor they perform, the laboring classes are worse off than they are here. If we worked no more hours in a day, no more days in a week, and with no more intensity, than do the Italian peasants, we should find ourselves in a condition scarcely superior to theirs. We receive only about the same proportion of the proceeds of our labor.

"Moreover everything is tending to reduce the workingmen of this country to the condition they are sunk to in the old world. And what is that condition? In England, Scotland, and Wales, fourteen millions of the population, it is said, are obliged to subsist on an annual income of about ninety dollars a year and under. Five millions of these subsist on an annual income of less than twenty-five dollars each. In some counties in England, prior to the new poor laws, the paupers amounted to 63 per cent. on the whole population, and in Liverpool every third individual was in indigence. Of Ireland, we need say nothing more than that one third of the whole population experience a deficiency of even third rate potatoes for thirty weeks out of fifty-two. In France, out of a population of about thirty-two millions, nearly thirty-one millions receive an annual income of under seventy-five dollars each; seven millions five hundred thousand, under twenty-five dollars; seven millions five hundred thousand, about eighteen dollars each. The expense of living is higher in England than in this country, and probably about one fourth less in France. But what must be the condition of the laboring classes even in France, where it is better than in England, and perhaps as good as in any country in Europe with the exception of Belgium?

"Now, what saves us from a similar condition? We are saved from a similar condition mainly by the paucity of our numbers, and the superior freedom of our industry, which creates a greater competition among capitalists, and therefore a greater demand for laborers. But this competition is less among manufacturers than it was. The principal manufacturers having adopted in regard to labor nearly uniform prices, rarely bid upon one another. The multiplication of large corporations is rapidly changing the whole character of our laboring population, by bringing them under the control of corporate bodies. These corporations check individual enterprise, lessen competition between individual capitalists, bind the capital-

ists together in close affinity of interest, and enable them to exert a sovereign control over the prices of labor. Let these corporations continue to increase for a few years longer, and they will be able to reduce our wages to the minimum of human subsistence. There will grow up around them a population bearing but little resemblance to that which won our political independence. It will be enfeebled in mind and body, and without either the mental or physical energy to shift its employment, or to make a firm stand for the amelioration of its condition.

"Hitherto the great mass of our laboring population has been bred in the agricultural districts, and consequently could easily shift from the city or the factory village to the farm. But this will not continue to be the case for another generation. Nor is this all. Lands are monopolized; the whole earth is foreclosed. However well disposed the laborer might be to cultivate the soil, he has not the means of becoming its owner. He has no spot on which to erect him a cabin, or on which he may raise a few potatoes to feed his wife and little ones; for the broad hands of the few cover it all over.

"Nor can we stop here. It would seem that the more we produced the better should be our condition. But this is not the fact except for short seasons. We suffer from over-production. To-day the supply is small, and the demand is brisk, we find employment and receive tolerable wages. But a hundred capitalists have rushed simultaneously into the work of producing; all hands are employed; forthwith the demand is supplied; the market is glutted; sales are diminished; and the diminished sales return upon us in the shape of a reduction of wages. To make up for this reduction of wages, we must labor more hours, or with greater intensity, and increase the amount of our production; and this increased amount of production, returns upon us again in the shape of a still farther reduction of our wages; and thus on, till they are reduced to the lowest point compatible with our existence.

"Brethren, put these things together, and tell us, if the natural tendency in this country is not to reduce us, and that at no distant day, to the miserable condition of the laboring classes in the old world? We stand on the declivity; we have already begun to descend! What is to save us?

"Brethren, this is a question of fearful import to us and our children. It is a question we must put to ourselves in sober earnest. It is a question we must put *now*, for a little more delay and it will be too *LATE*. Is it not already too late? God forbid! We will not believe it too late; but we feel that not a moment is to be lost. Now or never, must our salvation be secured. How shall it be done?

"Brethren, our salvation must, through the blessing of God, come from ourselves. It is useless to expect it from those whom our labors enrich. It is for their interest to augment our numbers and our poverty. It is their interest to purchase our labor at the lowest rate possible; it is ours to sell it at the highest rate possible. Their interest and ours, then, stand in direct opposition to each other. The greater our numbers, the more necessitous our con-

dition, the greater is the facility with which they can obtain laborers, and the lower the price they are obliged to pay for labor. The fewer our numbers, the more independent our condition, the higher is the price we can demand and obtain for our labor. This refutes the pretensions of the aristocracy, that their interests and ours are one and the same. As men, as human beings, no doubt their interest and ours are the same; but their interests as capitalists, and ours as laborers, are directly opposite, and mutually destructive. In fact there is less identity of interest between the capitalists and us, than there is between the master and the slave. The slave is the master's property, and it is for the master's interest to take care of his property: it is for his interest to give his slave a sufficiency of food, and to be careful not to overwork him; for the sickness or death of his slave would be a loss of property. The same principle, which leads a man to take good care of his horses, sheep, and oxen, would lead him to take good care of his slaves. But the capitalist has no other interest in us, than to get as much labor out of us as possible. We are hired men, and hired men, like hired horses, have no souls. If a man owns the horse he drives, he will take care not to injure him; but if the horse be a hired one, what he will do, is told in a common saying, "Hired horses have no souls; drive on." "Hired men have no souls; drive on." If we sicken and die, the loss is ours, not the employer's. *There are enough more ready to take our places.*

"Brethren, we conjure you, therefore, not to believe a word of what is said about your interest and that of your employers being the same. Your interests and theirs are in the nature of things, hostile and irreconcilable. Then do not look to them for relief. Be not so mad as to suppose that they will voluntarily work out your salvation for you. You must expect them to be governed mainly by their own interests, and must never rely on their doing, as a body, what it is not for their interest to do. If then you have ever expected the capitalist, the accumulator, contractor, and employer, to conspire to elevate your condition, expect it no longer. As well might the poor and depressed have expected the Gospel, which is good news to the poor, from the scribes and pharisees, the chief priests and elders, who crucified Jesus for proclaiming it. Where, then, shall we look?

"Shall we look to politicians? What have politicians done for us, during the last fifty years? They have talked much about the rights, interests, and dignity of labor; they have had smiling faces, soft voices, and fair speeches for us; but what have *they* DONE for us? We want *DEEDS*, not *words*; *deeds* not promises. Only two measures, having special reference to the laboring classes, have as yet been carried, or even partially carried by our politicians; one the extension of the elective franchise, and the other a mitigation, for we cannot call it the abolition, of imprisonment for debt. This is all that the American politicians have as yet done, to carry out the American system, and to reduce to practice the great truth, that "all men are created equal." Politicians can therefore, give but a poor account of themselves. All parties profess to have a special



affection for our interests, and assure us that, if we will give them our suffrages, our interests shall be protected; but thus far whichever party has succeeded at the polls, the interest of the capitalist has been sure to triumph in the halls of legislation and at the tribunals of justice. Politicians want our votes; but, when they have obtained our votes, we are the least of their concern. Nothing is to be hoped from politicians; unless we give them to understand, that our votes are for them only on one condition; namely, *that they wed themselves, indissolubly, to our interests*, which are in fact the true interests of all men, viewed simply as men.

“What have we to hope from the political parties of the day, each of which is vociferating its friendship for us? From the whig party we have nothing to hope. It represents the interests of the capitalist, of the employer, and, therefore, interests directly adverse to ours. Its professions of regard for the poor laborer, we understand and despise. We have heard them too often to be able to confide in them; we have, and can have, no confidence in those who feel that to take us by the hand it is necessary for them to *descend*. Nobody will be true to us, who does not feel in his soul, that his feet stand on the same level with ours. We have, then, nothing to hope from the whigs. And so far as we can see, they have not the shadow of a claim to our suffrages.

“What have we to hope from the democratic party? Certainly, if there be any difference, more than we have from the whig party. We are far from having entire confidence in the leaders of the democratic party, so called. We could find no little fault with many of them. They seem to us to have no clear conceptions and no ardent love of the great doctrine of equality, on which they harp so much; and we trust we do them no wrong, when we say that they will defend equal rights only so far as is necessary to place themselves in office. A considerable portion of the democratic party differ from the whigs only in name. They have the same attachment to banks, corporations, and high tariffs; and if they could have their way, government would still be administered in the interests of business, not of labor. Nevertheless, at the present moment, there is apparently no little preference due to the administration party. So far as it concerns the General Government, this party appears to us to have adopted just principles. It adheres to the Constitution; and labors to restrict the General Government to the few, but important purposes, for which it was originally instituted. It favors State rights; and opposes any encroachment upon them, not only by the Federal Executive, but also by Congress and the Federal Judiciary. It opposes a national bank, and provides for the collecting, keeping, and disbursing the public revenues, without recourse to banks, or the business of banking. It also opposes a national debt, and, we believe, a protective tariff. It would leave all the great interests of the country to the protection of the natural and immutable laws of trade. This is much, and all that we can ask of the General Government.

“It is not from the action of the General Government that we are to look for relief. The matters which chiefly concern us come not



within its province. Its aid to us can be at best only negative. All we can ask of it is, that it shall adopt no measures injurious to us. In the hands of the present party we have no such measures to apprehend. The administration has shown itself well disposed towards the laborer; and as it knows that it must rely for its support mainly on our suffrages, we have no fears of its failing to do for us, all it can do constitutionally.

"If we come into our own State, we still have nothing to hope from the whigs. We know the views of their candidate for Governor. He professes to be our friend; but he has proposed no method of befriending us, but the establishment of a high tariff to increase the profit of the capitalist, and a national bank to inflate still more the currency, to enhance the prices of whatever we must buy, and reduce our wages still lower. So far as our salvation is to be effected by the agency of Government, it must be done by the State Governments; of course then we should take a greater interest in the constitution and administration of the State Governments than in those of the Federal Government. Are the views of the present democratic party in this State, such as should meet our approbation? In the abstract they are. But we cannot deny that we find not so much explicitness as to actual measures as we could wish. Were we asked what the party proposes to do in case it comes into power, we should be somewhat puzzled to answer. Some of its prominent members have occasionally leaned quite too far towards the aristocracy, and advanced doctrines which we do not entertain. Nevertheless, we find in the party much to approve. Their candidate for Governor, our present Chief Magistrate, has proved that his sympathies, up to a certain point, are with the workingmen. He has declared himself opposed to the present iniquitous banking system, which is much, although he may not have declared so fully his views concerning what should be adopted in its place. He has declared himself opposed to the favorite plan of the Stock-jobbers, of loaning the credit of the State to corporations, and he has ably opposed the whole system of corporations, of which we have complained. He states it to be the duty of government to aim to introduce the greatest practicable equality among all the members of the community; he is in favor of universal suffrage, and contends that representation is a right of *man* and not of *property*. His Address to the Legislature at the last session was, in the main, unexceptionable, the most thoroughly democratic, in its spirit and tendency, of any Governor's Message, which has ever fallen under our notice; and we have reason to believe that it was generally satisfactory to the workingmen throughout the Union. A more unexceptionable candidate it would not be easy to select; and we have no reason to apprehend that in his hands the Government would be turned against us. So far as we know his views, they go in the right direction, although they may possibly fall short of our own. When the question comes up, as it now does, whether the workingmen shall vote for him or his whig competitor, it seems to us that no workingman can hesitate a moment to prefer Marcus Morton to John Davis.

"But, brethren, although we may give our votes to the administration party in the present crisis as *the best we can do*, we must not sink ourselves in that party and suffer its leaders to lead us whithersoever they please. We must take our own stand, independent of both existing parties; adopt our own principles; propose our own measures; and support this or that party only so far as we have the surest pledges the nature of the case will admit, that by so doing we shall be doing something for the interests of labor. We must assume a position, as we may, from which we can make our own terms with the politicians of either party. Our interests have been neglected long enough; they must be neglected no longer. We can no longer consent to labor merely to elevate our masters. We must say to the whig party, and to the democratic party; Here are our measures, here is what we demand; the party which will pledge itself honestly to our measures, and faithfully pursue them, shall have our suffrages; but no other party shall. We take our stand with our principles and measures; with them we will triumph, or bear defeat.

"Brethren, in order to be able to assume this position, we must organize ourselves, and act in concert. The privileged classes have always prevailed against us, though we are the many and they the few, because they have combined their numbers and acted together. We must not disdain to follow their example, so far as to combine in our own defence. We would, therefore, recommend to our brethren throughout the Commonwealth and the Union, to organize themselves into associations, which, by mutual correspondence, may bring about a concert of action between all the workingmen of the country. We would recommend that the workingmen in each town, or city, or village, should form themselves into an association for mutual improvement and protection. The association should have its Constitution, By-Laws, and Officers. Its officers may be more or fewer as each association may judge best; but one of them should be a Corresponding Secretary, through whom the association may correspond with sister associations. When the association has organized itself, let it draw up a declaration of Rights; and then let it meet once a week, if convenient, for the discussion of the principles and measures necessary to be adopted for securing to each individual member of the community at large, the full and practical enjoyment of his rights. In this way we shall be improving our minds, enlarging our knowledge, and preparing ourselves to act understandingly in defence of our rights and interests.

"In this way, too, we shall constitute ourselves a Power in the State, and a power which no party will dare offend. In this way we shall make ourselves strong enough to command that respect from politicians and statesmen, which we deserve, and to make them fear to postpone our just claims.

"No doubt the aristocracy will cry out against a proposal like the one we have suggested. No matter; they have combined for ages against us. Turn about is fair play. We will now combine in our own defence, and see which will triumph, a combination of **MEN** or a combination of **WEALTH**.

"Brethren, we throw out these suggestions for your consideration. Our interests are the same; our sufferings are similar; and the means needed for our relief are identical. Let us then understand one another. Let us put our heads, our hearts, and our shoulders together. Let us become a band of brothers, sworn to stand by one another in good report and in evil, in life and in death, With our interests are identified those of the race. The well-being of all the future generations of our countrymen is committed to us. Let us then be true to ourselves, and in being true to ourselves, and to one another, we shall be true to our country, to our God, and to universal man."

#### ART. V. LITERARY NOTICES.

*Social Destiny of Man: Or Association and Reorganization of Industry. Our Evils are Social not Political;—Political Evils are results of the false Organization of Society.* BY ALBERT BRISBANE. Philadelphia. C. F. Stollmeyer, 1840, 12mo. pp. 480.—It was our intention to notice this work at length; but on examining it somewhat attentively, we find that it would require more time and space, than we can now command, to do anything like justice either to its author or to ourselves. We must therefore be content to give it for the present a mere passing notice, leaving a more extended review till such time as we may find ourselves more at leisure. The work is timely, and full of important principles and suggestions. It is a condensed summary of the scheme of M. C. Fourier for the reorganization of Industry, and cannot fail to be read with intense interest by all who are disposed to believe that the present system of industrial arrangement is susceptible of improvement. It is written in a calm, philanthropic, and yet earnest spirit, and does great credit both to the talents and the benevolence of its author.

We do not feel competent to give even the outlines of the scheme here proposed, and certainly not competent to sit in judgment on all its details. We may say, however, that the Author does not look for the melioration of the fate of the millions from mere political changes, that is, changes in the organization or administration of the State. The evils he sees lie deeper than forms of Government; they lie back of the state, and are so far from being effects of vicious forms of government, or mal-administrations, that they are themselves the cause of all that is faulty or vicious in either. They are not political evils, but social. In denying that they are political, he does not fall into the quite common mistake of considering them individual, and therefore capable of being removed by individual exertions alone. He distinguishes between politics and what we suppose we may term socialism. Politics relate solely to the State. But the State is not

**Society.** The state is the government; in a monarchy it is the monarch; in an aristocracy it is the privileged few; in a democracy, taking the etymology of the word for our authority, it is the common people, or simply the people, as distinguished from the nobility. Whatever relates to the organization of the state, the distribution of its powers, and the discharge of its functions, belongs to the department of politics. Society lies back of the state, and is its creator and sovereign. The state is the mere agent of society, and will always be what the will of society ordains. If society be right, if its institutions be founded in justice, the state will be just and beneficent; if society be wrong, founded on false principles, and sustained by unequal, and therefore unjust, institutions, it is in vain, that you seek to reform your government, or perfect its administration.

It follows from this, that the concern of the Reformer is not with politics, but with society; and his aim should be to reform the institutions on which society rests.

Now, aside from our social instincts, the basis of society is Industry, expressed in the institution of Property. The character of society will correspond to the distribution of property, and the distribution of property must correspond to the organization of industry. Consequently, in order to effect any given social reform, you must strike at the existing organization of industry. When this organization is in harmony with the laws of human nature and the material world, society will present to man free and full scope for the harmonious development of all his faculties, and enable him to attain to what thus far he has fruitlessly sought — happiness, individual and social.

Our present organization of industry is vicious in the extreme. It is carried on in solitude, at great wastefulness, without anything to render it attractive, cheering, enlivening. It is incoherent. Man does not act in harmony with man; there is no union, no concert, but competition, estrangement, antagonism, exhausting the strength of individuals without yielding them a supply for their wants. From this wretched, incoherent industry flow, as so many natural streams, all our evils.

These evils are vividly portrayed in the work before us, and the defects of the present industrial arrangements clearly and, so far as we are able to judge, correctly pointed out. But it leaves us not here. It proposes a remedy. This remedy is to be found in the substitution of associated industry, for individual, coherent for incoherent, and in rendering labor attractive, so that man will feel the same passion for it that sportsmen do for the pleasures of the chase. The main body of the work is taken up with details of the plan of association, and of the methods by which this passionate fondness for labor may be created. Into these details we cannot enter, but must refer our readers to the book itself. Setting aside the details, of which we are not prepared to judge, we have no hesitancy in expressing our entire sympathy with the fundamental principles of the work, especially since in demanding associated labor, it by no means sacrifices individual property. It recognises both individual property



and communal property, and seems to have hit upon very nearly the proper limits of each.

We are pleased to learn that some friends of Mr. Brisbane's views, have commenced in Buffalo, N. Y., a journal devoted to their defence, called the *Phalanx*, and still more pleased to hear that Mr. Brisbane himself either has started, or is about to start, a journal in the city of New-York, designed expressly to give the public information concerning his system, and to urge its adoption. We assure him that we shall rejoice in his success, and cannot but augur good from the attempt, however it may terminate.

*Woman and her Master.* BY LADY MORGAN. Philadelphia. Cary and Hart. 2 Vols. 12mo. — These are two very sprightly volumes, and we have read them with pleasure. They contain much interesting matter, and manifest no little insight into the true significance of several dark passages in ancient history. They are characterized by a tone of commendable freedom and independence. Lady Morgan is rarely deterred from seeing the truth or telling it, by fear of the bigoted or the superstitious. Her remarks on the contest in which Saul was engaged with the priests, and which terminated in his overthrow, and the accession to the crown by David, the son of Jesse, are worthy the attention of modern divines themselves.

Lady Morgan deserves no little credit for the able manner in which she has vindicated the moral and intellectual claims of her sex. She has undertaken, and thus far successfully prosecuted, a work which has long been needed, and which will not be without results. Her views are in general just, and her arguments weighty, if not always conclusive; but in one respect, in her zeal for the rights and dignity of woman, she seems to us to carry the matter a little too far. We cannot agree with her that woman has always proved herself man's superior, in all except mere brute force. We admit readily her equality, but we are as incapable of yielding her the supremacy as we should be of claiming it for ourselves. Woman should be satisfied with the frank admission of her equality, and not risk that by laying claim to superiority. We do not, however, like this drawing of comparisons where none are admissible. The two sexes are equal but different. In some qualities, moral and intellectual, man has the advantage; woman has the advantage in others. Neither alone possesses in their fulness all the moral and intellectual qualities of human nature. One is the complement of the other; and in order to obtain the full "orbed" being, the two must be united. As to the superiority of the one, or the inferiority of the other, nothing need be said, except that one is not the other, and would gain or lose nothing by being the other.

As a general rule, spontaneity predominates in woman, reflection in man. In sudden inspirations woman is the superior; in what requires long watching, wearisome study, painful analysis, and calm reflection, man is superior. In regard to the virtues, woman unquestionably excels in some respects, and man in others; but that the balance upon the whole is unequal between them, we are not disposed to believe. In these days of fierce contention for woman's



rights, it has become almost necessary to stand on our defence, and assert man's rights. Men are not all devils, nor are women all angels. Man sometimes abuses his superior physical strength, but woman rarely fails to find her revenge. If she is sometimes his victim, he is sometimes hers; and her power over him probably is as great, and as often abused, as his over her. He sometimes leaves her to pine in mute sorrow, and he is sometimes driven into vice because she, the angel wife, fails to make his home a paradise. When we are young we may say pretty things, and be gallant at the expense of truth. We are just silly enough to do so, and have just little enough respect for woman, to dream that in this way we shall best please her fancy, and win the way to her heart. But a different language becomes us as we grow older. God made man in his own image; male and female made he them. We should always regard the two as constituting but one being. It takes them both to realize the Divine Archetype of Man. We should therefore never seek to exalt one at the expense of the other. They are the two halves of one whole, and equally necessary one to the other.

That woman has not held, and does not yet hold, her true rank in civil society, we are not disposed to deny. Man has made himself her master, and by so doing has become her slave. The consequences of this are bad to both. We would abolish all idea of master-ship in the case. Man should not call himself woman's lord, that she may have the power through his affections or his lusts to lead him as she pleases. Hitherto woman has had no acknowledged right of interference in the affairs of the world. Her appropriate sphere has been held to be subordinate; and her duty that of obeying the will and pleasure of man. Our social and political institutions are exclusively masculine, and bear on their face the incompleteness which always must be looked for in that which is the product of one sex alone. We have erred in regarding man alone as a social element. The element of society is man indeed, but man as in the original creation, male and female. When man and woman in mystic union shall be regarded as the element of society, our political and social institutions will be neither incomplete nor barren, but they will be the full expression of the complete human being, and therefore adequate to all the wants of human nature.

In the great struggle for social equality which is coming on, woman is destined to play an important part. She is as much interested in this struggle as man. She may not be required to go into the political arena, may neither attend the polls, nor claim a seat in the legislative hall, but she must lend to the cause of social progress her powerful instincts, her sublime inspirations, and her generous sympathies. She must exalt the sentiments, purify the affections, and nerve the souls of the sterner, but more calculating, and therefore the more timid sex. Man is keener-sighted than woman, more disposed to look around, before and after, and more capable of appreciating the obstacles there may be to encounter in the prosecution of a grand undertaking. In this clearness of vision lies his weakness, the source of his hesitation to engage with all his soul; the reason why he so seldom attempts to realize what his heart craves, and his rea-

son approves. Woman sees by a sudden inspiration the end to be gained, and overlooks all intermediate difficulties, which is a great advantage. She pauses not at obstacles, and heeds not dangers, or death. She is, when inspired with a noble idea, the very soul of heroism, and capable of imparting it to man. In the great work which is still to be done for the human race, there is much to dare and to suffer, from which calculating prudence recoils. Woman's office is to come to our rescue, rally the retreating, and breathe into man's soul a more generous confidence, a spirit of nobler daring, to exalt his courage, and make him as it were blind by the omnipotence of the sentiment that moves him, and the brilliancy of the end to be gained. Every man who would achieve a noble victory for humanity, must have a sort of recklessness, at which the wise and prudent shake their heads. It is only woman that can give us this sublime recklessness, raise us above our calculations, and make us feel that the highest prudence is to wed ourselves to the noble cause, and live for it, or die for it, as the chances may turn out. Woman's influence is not indeed that of the wise and cautious commander, but that of the inspired bard, whose songs and odes thrill through the souls of the commonest soldiers, and make the meanest a hero.

---

*History of the United States from the Discovery of the American Continent.* By GEORGE BANCROFT. Vol. III. Boston: Little & Brown. 1840. 8vo. pp. 463.—We shall not be guilty of the imperitine of praising this work by one of our most distinguished scholars. The public has passed sentence on it, and its rapid sales declare with sufficient distinctness the nature of that sentence, which, to say the least, is not one of condemnation. The volume before us brings the History down to the middle of the eighteenth century, and completes the History of the Colonization of the United States. Its execution fully sustains, and in some respects more than sustains, the high reputation acquired by the previous volumes. It surpasses them in simplicity of style, and in the composure and gravity of its tone; and proves to us that the author's political labors have served to mature and not to distract his powers. We hope the author will proceed in his labors, and commence immediately the History of the Revolution, which, on many accounts must be a superior work to this of the Colonization. The public will not suffer him to discontinue his work till he has brought it down to the latest period. In conclusion we must be permitted to congratulate the author on his success, and the country, that she has already found one of her sons, able to erect a lasting monument to her genius.

---

*The Dial. A Magazine for Literature, Philosophy, and Religion. To be continued Quarterly.* Nos. I. and II. Boston: Weeks, Jordan & Co. 1840.—This Magazine, which was commenced last July, has already acquired a reputation; and it promises to exert no inconsiderable influence on the thought and literature of this country. It may be regarded, we suppose, as the organ of the Transcendentalists, or exquisites of the movement party,—radicals indeed, of a most ultra stamp, but nevertheless radicals, who would radicalize in

kid gloves and sattin slippers. The Dialists belong to the genus *cullotic*, and have no fellowship with your vulgar *sans-cullottes*.

The opening address of the editors to their readers is unnecessarily offensive. The prophet Elijah once took it into his head that of all God's prophets he alone was left: but the Lord rebuked him, and told him that he had, even in Israel, reserved seven thousand who had not bowed the knee to Baal. It is foolish to affect to ignore all excellence but one's own. True greatness is always able and willing to recognise merit even in the lowly and obscure.

The Dial contains pieces in prose and verse, and in general inserts its poetry in its prose, and its prose in its rhymes. Some of its prose pieces are more poetical, than most of its pieces in verse. There is a magic of poetry that hovers over the essay on Modern Literature in the second number, which proves the writer deserves to rank high among the inspired. "The Problem," however, in the first number, is not merely verse, it is poetry, and unsurpassed, if equalled, by any production of the American muse, with which we are acquainted. "Wood Notes," in the second number, apparently by the same author, are passable, but they fall far short of the sweet, wild, sad music, every true lover of nature hears whenever he walks the woods. For ourselves we have no patience with the poetry that babbles of flowers, woods, rivers, and other external objects. The poet rarely reproduces what we have felt when left alone with nature. We feel her beauty, yield to her influence, without breaking out, "How beautiful!" or attempting to depict the objects from which the spell that is upon us proceeds. We love Nature too well to read the poet's description, and her wild notes are ringing too distinctly, too sweetly in our ears, to permit us to be pleased with any attempts to imitate them. Nevertheless, this criticism does not exactly apply to these "Wood Notes," which are better than most notes of the kind.

The criticisms on painting and statuary scattered through these numbers make some pretensions, but they seem to have been derived from reading, rather than from observation.

Of this Magazine, we may say in general, it is a truly remarkable work. It is full of rich thought, though somewhat injured by its puerile conceits, and childish expressions. Its thought is in general superior to its expression. Its authors seem to have caught some partial glimpses, and to have felt the movings of a richer, a higher life, which carries them away, and which as yet they have not been able to master. To our taste they want robustness, manliness, and practical aims. They are too vague, evanescent, aerial; but nevertheless, there is a "sad sincerity" about many of them; and one cannot help feeling, that these after all are the men and women who are to shape our future. On many sides they expose themselves to ridicule, but at bottom, there is a serious, solemn purpose, of which even they are but half conscious. Though we often find them too ultra for our belief, and sometimes too finical for our taste, yet we view their movements with deep interest, and hope from their labors, much to lead to a new and a higher life for the individual, and for the world.

*Grandfather's Chair: A History for Youth.* By NATHANIEL HAWTHORNE; Author of *Twice-Told Tales*. Boston: E. P. Peabody. 1841. — This is a delightful little book, the production of true genius, and which will fetch a response alike from youth and age, from the unlettered and the learned. We assure Mr. Hawthorne that we thank him both for our own and our children's sake for appearing again in print; and would beg him to proceed with all reasonable despatch in the wonderful and touching adventures of GRANDFATHER'S CHAIR. He will find us in the attitude to listen, or if not, he will soon compel us to listen.

*Emancipation:* By WM. E. CHANNING. Boston. E. P. Peabody. 1840. 12mo. pp. 111. — We have no space to enter into a discussion of the important subject treated in this little work, and no production by Dr. Channing needs any commendation from us to secure it the attention it deserves. The work treats mainly on the working of Emancipation in the West Indies, and proves what we have often asserted, that the system of wages is a much more successful method for the exploitation of man by man than slavery itself. We cannot, however, forbear expressing our astonishment that the following passage could ever have fallen from the pen of so accurate an observer, and so truth-loving a writer as Dr. Channing. "*It is with deep sorrow, that I am compelled to turn to the contrast between religion in England and religion in America. There it vindicates the cause of the oppressed. Here it rivets the chain and hardens the heart of the oppressor.*" Does Dr. Channing believe this? Does religion in England plead the cause of the poor Irish, where out of a population of about Eight Millions, every third person experiences a deficiency of even third rate potatoes for thirty weeks in a year? Does it plead the cause of some Eleven Millions of wretched proletarians in England and Wales, a large portion of whom are in a condition almost infinitely below that of the Negro slave? Does it vindicate the cause of the oppressed Millions in India, victims of the avarice and tyranny of her East India Company? To talk of *English* religion vindicating the cause of the oppressed, betrays an ignorance almost inexcusable. England is at this moment the grand enemy of Humanity, the enslaver of the nations, and arch oppressor of the laborer, and when has her religion rebuked her?

Nor was it religion that emancipated the slaves in the West Indies. If the East India Company had said nay, or had not desired it for their own interest, the religion of England might have screamed herself hoarse over the suffering slave, without having loosened a single fetter. England is the corruptest nation on earth, and her religion is of a piece with her general character. When her religion commands her to free her slaves at home, to show a disposition even to attempt to repair in the slightest degree the wrongs, she has for seven hundred years inflicted on unhappy Ireland, to do something to mitigate the wretchedness of her operatives, besides shooting down or imprisoning the poor Chartists, we will listen to eulogiums on the religion of England; but till then we call down upon her the indignation of a just God, and the curses, deep, burning,



blasting curses of the oppressed everywhere. We assure Dr. Channing that it is with deep sorrow that we have found him, the pure-minded friend of religion, the warm-hearted defender of the rights of the oppressed everywhere, holding up England, or the religion of England, in favorable contrast to his own country. This is to stab Liberty in the house of her friends. It is to do what one can do to place the religion and philanthropy of this country at the service of the worshippers of mammon, and make Christ do homage to the devil.

*The Rhode Island Book: Selections in Prose and Verse, from the Writings of Rhode-Island Citizens.* By ANNE C. LYNCH. Providence: H. Fuller. 1841. 12mo. pp. 352. — We received this book at too late a moment to be able to notice it as it deserves. We can only say that, from a slight glance at the pages, we have satisfied ourselves that Miss Lynch has acquitted herself of a difficult task with great delicacy and judgment. Her selections appear to be made with great fairness, and indicate on the part of the editor a commendable liberality of sentiment and correctness of taste. We meet here the names of many of our friends, of not a few of our old acquaintances, and one especially, Mr. Green, the author of "Old Grimes," whom we have admired ever since we could remember. The book gives us a favorable impression of Rhode-Island Literature, notwithstanding the impossibility of anything like justice being done to it, in a volume of mere selections. As a book, however, it is much more readable, and altogether of a higher order, than the Boston Book, for this or any other year. We commend it to our readers as an agreeable, interesting, and upon the whole instructive volume of miscellanies, well deserving place on the centre table.

We have little space for extracts, but we cannot resist the temptation of subjoining the following by the Editor.

#### PAUL PREACHING AT ATHENS.

SUGGESTED BY THE CARTOON OF RAFFAELLE.

Greece! hear that joyful sound,  
A stranger's voice upon thy sacred hill,  
Whose tones shall bid the slumbering nations round,  
Wake with convulsive thrill.  
Athenians! gather there, he brings you words,  
Brighter than all your boasted lore affords.

He brings you news of One  
Above Olympian Jove. One in whose light  
Your gods shall fade like stars before the sun.  
On your bewildered night,  
That UNKNOWN GOD, of whom ye darkly dream,  
In all his burning radiance shall beam.

Behold, he bids you rise  
From your dark worship round that idol shrine,  
He points to him who reared your starry skies,  
And bade your Phæbus shine.  
Lift up your souls from where in dust ye bow,  
That God of gods commands your homage now.



But brighter tidings still !  
 He tells of one whose precious blood was spilt  
 In lavish streams upon Judea's hill,  
     A ransom for your guilt, —  
 Who triumphed o'er the grave, and broke its chain ;  
 Who conquered Death and Hell, and rose again.

Sages of Greece ! come near —  
 Spirits of daring thought and giant mould.  
 Ye questioners of time and nature, hear  
     Mysteries before untold !  
 Immortal life revealed ! light for which ye  
 Have tasked in vain your proud philosophy.

Searchers for some first cause !  
 Midst doubt and darkness — lo ! he points to One,  
 Where all your vaunted reason lost must pause,  
     And faint to think upon ;  
 That was from everlasting, that shall be  
 To everlasting still, eternally.

Ye followers of him  
 Who deemed his soul a spark of Deity !  
 Your fancies fade, — your master's dreams grow dim  
     To this reality.  
 Stoic ! unbend that brow, drink in that sound !  
 Skeptic ! dispel those doubts, the Truth is found.

Greece ! though thy sculptured walls  
 Have with thy triumphs and thy glories rung,  
 And through thy temples and thy pillared halls  
     Immortal poets sung, —  
 No sound like these have rent your startled air,  
 They open realms of light and bid you enter there.

---

*Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit.* By S. T. COLERIDGE. Edited from the Author's Manuscript. By HENRY NELSON COLERIDGE. Boston: J. Munroe & Co. 1841. 12mo. pp. 129. — This is a somewhat interesting little work, by a man who thought much, talked well, and wrote too little. It consists of seven letters to a friend, never before published, "concerning the bounds between the right and the superstitious view and estimation of the Sacred Canon, in which the writer submissively discloses his own private judgment on the following questions.

"I. Is it necessary or expedient to insist on the belief of the divine origin and authority of all, and every part of the canonical books as the condition, or first principle of Christian faith?"

"II. Or may not the due appreciation of the Scriptures collectively be more safely relied on as the result and consequence of the belief in Christ; the gradual increase, in respect of particular passages, of our spiritual discernment of their truth and authority, supplying a test and measure of our own growth and progress as individual believers, without the servile fear that prevents or overclouds the free honor which cometh from love? 1 John iv. 18."

To the first question Mr. Coleridge answers in the negative, and therefore denies the doctrine of plenary inspiration; to the second he answers in the affirmative, and therefore makes the Christian's experience the test and measure of the truth and authority of the Scriptures. His doctrine on the Bible is virtually the doctrine which we ourselves have long entertained, and frequently set forth. It is therefore with pleasure that we welcome the publication of these "Confessions." To the numerous admirers of Coleridge in this country, they will need no commendation. To those among us, — and they are many, — who worship the mere letter, it will be a useful present.

---

*Airs of Palestine, and other Poems.* BY JOHN PIERPONT. Boston: James Munroe & Co. 1840. 12mo. pp. 334. — We are hardly pardonable for not having noticed these poems sooner, and we regret that we can only notice their publication now. We can merely add that this volume presents quite a variety, both as to the kind and the quality of its contents. Many of the *Devotional* pieces will be found suitable for the expression of pious feeling, and worthy to rank beside the productions of Watts and Doddridge. The *Airs of Palestine*, the longest poem in the collection, is generally smooth and musical in its versification, and some portions of it are in a high degree poetical. Of the *Occasional* pieces, those in praise of cold water, and in vindication of the right of petition, are the best. Mr. Pierpont is no sentimentalist, no transcendentalist, but he has a free, bold mind, strong and generous impulses, much genuine feeling, and an eye for the picturesque and the beautiful in nature, many of the characteristic qualities of a true poet, and the volume before us is highly creditable to his industry, his genius, and above all to his moral and religious principles.

---

*Essay on the Character and Influence of Washington in the Revolution of the United States of America.* BY M. GUIZOT. Translated from the French. Boston: James Munroe & Co. 1840. 16mo. pp. 188. — This, like every thing from the pen of M. Guizot, at present the able Minister of Foreign Affairs in the French Cabinet, possesses no ordinary value. It is in general a very fair and a very just estimate of the character of Washington. It errs, however, we think, by overrating Washington's influence in our Revolution. No man was, or could be, under the circumstances, better fitted to conduct the armies of the Republic, and no man ever proved himself more faithful to his trust. Still, he did not make the Revolution, nor was he the Deliverer or Saviour of his country. The American Revolution was the work of no one man, but of the American people. The American people declared and achieved their independence, and to them, not to any chief, not even to Washington, belongs, under God, the glory. In no country in the world are mere individuals, however great, of so little importance as in ours. We have a great people, and therefore are never at the mercy of great chiefs.